

Making Sense of a Mediterranean Controversy in Byzantine Africa

The Collectio Sichardiana and Justinian I's Condemnation of the Three Chapters

OMRI MATARASSO

In the summer of 431, more than one hundred and fifty bishops gathered in the city of Ephesus and deposed the bishop of the Byzantine capital, Nestorius of Constantinople.¹ With their judgment, the gathered bishops started a chain reaction across the Mediterranean world. Disorder and violence quickly spread from Ephesus to the imperial city as crowds protested or celebrated the conciliar decision.² Two opposing factions subsequently crystallized among the bishops in Ephesus, and a competition ensued over the loyalties of clerics from both the western and eastern provinces of the empire. Each faction advocated and cohered around elaborate Christological formulas, reflecting the core issues underlying Nestorius's deposition. But beyond their theological concerns, the two factions also attempted to expand their spheres of influence by bolstering complex networks of clerics and state officials bound to each other by relations of family, friendship, and patronage.³ The controversy took on an inertia of its own as a result of the factionalism that emerged in Ephesus: its various manifestations

in expressions of loyalty to the legacy of bishops and of solidarity within social circles would play as significant a role as theological disagreements in the ensuing controversy.

Following the conclusion of the conciliar proceedings in Ephesus and the dispersal of the participants, members of the two factions continued their lobbying measures, ranging from writing letters and doctrinal treatises to distributing gifts and payments among state officials and their families.⁴ The continued ecclesiastical disturbances, however, led the imperial court to exert its own pressure on the parties involved. By 433 this effort paid off when Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch, the leaders of the two factions, signed a reconciliation agreement. Known ever since as the *Formula of Reunion*, the agreement established a theological middle ground between the factions and confirmed Nestorius's deposition.⁵ But it took no longer than three years for the dispute between the two factions to resurface, this time over the teachings of the deceased Antiochene theologian Theodore of

1 The Council of Ephesus, first session (22 June 431), *Nestorii depositio ad eum missa a concilio* (CPG 8676), *Collectio Vaticana* 63, *ACO* 1.1.2, 64; trans. in R. Price and T. Graumann, *The Council of Ephesus of 431: Documents and Proceedings*, TTH 72 (Liverpool, 2020), 280.

2 T. E. Gregory, *Vox Populi: Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus, OH, 1979), 100–116.

3 A. M. Schor, *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria* (Berkeley, 2011).

4 F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II, 408–450* (Berkeley, 2006), 157–73; G. Bevan, *The New Judas: The Case of Nestorius in Ecclesiastical Politics, 428–451 CE* (Bristol, 2016), 194–206; and W. F. Beers, “‘Furnish Whatever Is Lacking to Their Avarice’: The Payment Programme of Cyril of Alexandria,” in *From Constantinople to the Frontier: The City and the Cities*, ed. N. S. M. Matheou, T. Kampianaki, and L. M. Bondioli (Leiden, 2016), 67–83.

5 Bevan, *New Judas*, 205–36, and Schor, *Theodoret's People*, 100–109.

Mopsuestia (d. 428). By the end of the decade the issue was resolved, but not without rousing and antagonizing clerics and ordinary believers from Egypt through Syria and from the western shores of the Black Sea all the way to Armenia.⁶

With the passing of John of Antioch in 442 and Cyril of Alexandria in 444, a new generation of revitalized disputers tried to fill their shoes. But regardless of the involvement of new personalities and their evolving motives, the factionalism originating in the conciliar proceedings in Ephesus and the theological Pandora's box opened by the nuanced dispute over Nestorius's teachings had already left a lasting mark on the Christian world. Most significantly, these developments fueled a process of canonization of texts and ideas that would sustain centuries of controversies: in any significant Christological pronouncement since Ephesus and its immediate aftermath, we will find a stable and persistent "Ephesian" layer consisting of references and citations of texts from the original clash between Nestorius, Cyril of Alexandria, and John of Antioch.⁷ Alongside allusions to and citations from the Bible and the Nicene Creed, this "Ephesian" layer, too, would become one of the most consistent features in the documentation surrounding the Christological controversies that divide the churches of the Middle East until this very day.⁸

In this paper I would like to suggest that controversy may not only separate and divide but also, perhaps paradoxically, connect people together—if only momentarily. In the following pages we will see how a collection of documents pertaining to the early fifth-century Nestorian Controversy presents an

elaborate narrative of a dispute stretching across the Mediterranean world. Assembled in the middle of the sixth century, the *Collectio Sichardiana* weaves together texts and ideas originating from diverse regions and intellectual traditions. Once we appreciate its underlying mechanics of transmission, arrangement, and redaction of texts, the *Sichardiana* illustrates the extent of interregional intellectual connectivity of the Mediterranean world in the middle of the sixth century.

When we reconstruct the historical circumstances in which the *Sichardiana* was engendered, the emerging narrative also receives a very local twist. Despite the survival of the collection's material remains in European copies spanning the late sixth century to the sixteenth, in the following pages I will present a detailed argument in favor of tracing the *Sichardiana*'s provenance to North Africa of the period following its Byzantine reconquest in 533–34. The collection was a local African response to Justinian I's doctrinal edict against the Three Chapters. The controversy that followed Justinian's edict gave renewed relevance to the dispute over Nestorius's teachings from the previous century and shook the great ecclesiastical centers around the eastern Mediterranean. This time, however, pockets of resistance also appeared in Italy,⁹ Merovingian Gaul,¹⁰ and, as we will see below, Byzantine Africa. Complementing and standing in conversation with recent scholarship of the late ancient and early medieval African church that focuses on the movement of its cultural artifacts, especially its elaborate cult of saints, throughout the wider Mediterranean world,¹¹ my reconstruction of the *Sichardiana* highlights the opposite direction of this movement: the local African reception of a wide range of materials documenting supposedly faraway disputes couched in arcane terminologies and carried in languages that were

6 Bevan, *New Judas*, 256–79; N. Constan, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1–5, Texts and Translations* (Leiden, 2003), 96–124.

7 Most notably, in the definition of faith pronounced at the Council of Chalcedon of 451, in Emperor Zeno's *Henotikon* of 482, and in Pope Hormisdas's *Libellus* of 515; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, 2nd ed., trans. J. Bowden (Atlanta, 1975), 543–50; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, vol. 2:1, *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte (Atlanta, 1987), 254–56; and V. L. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* (Oxford, 2008), 68–69.

8 For a deliberation over the "Ephesian" layer in a modern context, see, for example, J. S. Romanides, ed., "Unofficial Consultation between Theologians of Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, August 11–15, 1964: Papers and Minutes," *GOTR* 10.2 (1964–65): 7–160, esp. 93–95, for a discussion of the *Formula of Reunion*.

9 C. Straw, "Much Ado about Nothing: Gregory the Great's Apology to the Istrians," in *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth Century Mediterranean*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt (Turnhout, 2007), 121–60.

10 T. Stüber, "The Fifth Council of Orléans and the Reception of the 'Three Chapters Controversy' in Merovingian Gaul," in *The Merovingian Kingdom and the Mediterranean World, Revisiting the Sources*, ed. S. Esders, Y. Hen, P. Lucas, and T. Rotman (London, 2019), 93–102.

11 J. P. Conant, "Europe and the African Cult of Saints, circa 350–900: An Essay in Mediterranean Communications," *Speculum* 85.1 (2010): 1–46, and B. D. Shaw, "Doing It in Greek: Translating Perpetua," *Studies in Late Antiquity* 4.3 (2020): 309–45.

foreign to members of the African church. At the same time, my reconstruction of the *Sichardiana's* origins and temporal layers uncovers how African Christians made sense of an episode of Mediterranean history in a way that spoke to their local concerns. The *Collectio Sichardiana*, therefore, is not only a hitherto unappreciated source from late antique North Africa but also a window into the local African scholarly environment in which the collection was assembled, and whose participants navigated with ease any perceived intellectual boundary between the Latin West and Greek East.

Following a brief overview of the Three Chapters Controversy, I will start my analysis of the *Sichardiana* with the three sources that fragmentarily transmit the collection: two medieval manuscripts and one early modern printed volume. An understanding of the wider documentary context and editorial visions underlying the *Sichardiana's* three sources will help us understand why the *Sichardiana* survives in such a fragmented manner. It will also demonstrate the embeddedness of the *Sichardiana* in its two manuscript sources, and especially in the late sixth-century Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS LIX (57).¹² This embeddedness even suggests that some documents in Verona LIX (57) might have been part of the original *Sichardiana* but have never been recognized as such (see below, “A Dialogue between Equals” and “The *Sichardiana* and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57)”). A better understanding of the three sources that transmit the *Sichardiana* invalidates the possibility that the collection originated in a high medieval or early modern context and provides the first hint that the collection was assembled in late antiquity.

I will strengthen the argument in favor of the collection's late antique provenance by delving more deeply into the contents of the *Sichardiana*, an effort that will occupy the bulk of this paper. Starting my analysis with the rubrics of the collection's documents and their peculiar transmission in the collection's manuscripts, I will outline the careful order of presentation of the collection's documents, as well as both the information the documents divulge and the topics on which they maintain silence. My analysis of the *Sichardiana's* structure and contents will reveal its editor's underlying

apologetic project toward the Three Chapters. As I will argue in the concluding sections of this paper, the nuances and peculiarities embedded in this apologetic project point us to Byzantine Africa as the geographical origin of the collection's assembly.

The Three Chapters Controversy

Sometime between 543 and 545, Emperor Justinian I issued a doctrinal edict in which he condemned the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), the letter by Ibas of Edessa (d. 457) to Mari “the Persian,”¹³ and certain writings by Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. 460).¹⁴ With his request to clerics around the empire to condemn the “Three Chapters,” as the three condemned elements in the edict became known, Justinian attempted to mend the schism between the supporters and opponents of the definition of faith issued in the previous century at the Council of Chalcedon of 451. The controversial aspect of the Chalcedonian definition was its statement that Christ is one person in two natures, divine and human. The opponents of Chalcedon saw the council's definition as a confirmation of Nestorius's teachings: even though the condemnation of Nestorius issued by the Council of Ephesus of 431 had been repeated during the first session of the Council of Chalcedon,¹⁵ the opponents of Chalcedon argued that its strong dyophysite definition was nevertheless Nestorian in nature, implying a separation of the divinity and humanity of Christ into two ontologically distinct persons.¹⁶ With the condemnation of the Three Chapters, Justinian tried to distance the Chalcedonian definition from any hint of Nestorius's teachings by condemning fifth-century texts and persons who were perceived to have shared his views. At the same time, Justinian also defined the Three

13 M. Van Esbroeck, “Who Is Mari, the Addressee of Ibas' Letter?” *JTS* 38.1 (1987): 129–35.

14 Further details on Justinian's edict (CPG 6881) are in A. Grillmeier with T. Hainthaler, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte (Louisville, KY, 1994), 421–22, and T. C. Lounghis, B. N. Blysidu, and S. Lampkes, eds., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 476 bis 565* (Nicosia, 2005), no. 1288, 315.

15 R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 3 vols., TTH 45 (Liverpool, 2005), 1:323.

16 Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon*, 1:51–56.

12 For the mismatched Latin and Arabic numbers in the Biblioteca Capitolare's shelf marks, see W. Telfer, “The Codex Verona LX (58),” *HTR* 36.3 (1943): 245–46.

Chapters in their opposition to the teachings of Cyril of Alexandria, the most adamant opponent of Nestorius in the fifth century: Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose orthodoxy Cyril had already questioned in the Council of Ephesus of 431, had been Nestorius's teacher. Both Ibas in his letter to Mari and Theodoret in several of his writings criticized Cyril's theology, and in particular his anti-Nestorian *Twelve Chapters*. Therefore, by focusing on texts and persons who were affiliated with Nestorius and opposed to Cyril's teachings, Justinian demonstrated that there is no incongruity between rejecting Nestorius and accepting the Chalcedonian definition.¹⁷

Significant resistance to the condemnation of the Three Chapters rose from several groups of supporters of Chalcedon. One notable issue identified by the Chalcedonians was the possibility that Justinian's measures undermined the Council of Chalcedon itself. For among the decrees issued at the council we find the reinstatement of Theodoret and Ibas to the episcopal offices from which they had been previously deposed.¹⁸ Condemning writings of Theodoret and Ibas, the Chalcedonians reasoned, was equivalent to condemning outright two bishops who had subscribed and adhered to the Chalcedonian definition. It also potentially besmirched the decrees of Chalcedon, which acquitted and absolved them of an unjust deposition.¹⁹

Another difficulty with Justinian's condemnation was its perceived affront to accepted ecclesiastical norms. Certain supporters of Chalcedon argued that it is certainly legitimate to condemn heretical teachings, such as those allegedly found in some of the writings of the late Theodore of Mopsuestia, but it is unjustifiable to judge, to condemn, or to anathematize Christians who had passed away while in communion with the church. This sentiment is explicitly expressed in the *Constitutum de tribus capitulis* (also known as the *First Constitutum*) of Pope Vigilius (537–555).²⁰ In

order to strengthen his argument, Vigilius even refers to the writings of Cyril of Alexandria himself. Vigilius quotes a segment from Cyril's letter to John of Antioch recounting one of the sessions from the Council of Ephesus of 431.²¹ As part of the mounting evidence collected against Nestorius in Ephesus, a certain Charisios of Philadelphia (in Lydia, Asia Minor) had come before the council and presented a suspicious creed attributed to him.²² But as Cyril soon found out, the creed should have been attributed not to Nestorius but rather to his deceased teacher, Theodore of Mopsuestia. In the letter cited by Vigilius, Cyril clarifies that he and his fellow bishops at the Council of Ephesus did not dare to condemn the deceased Theodore or anyone "who departed this life in the episcopacy."²³ Expanding on Cyril's words, Vigilius concludes the citation by stressing that "what the blessed Cyril described above . . . was something he wanted to be understood as suitable for extension into a rule of the Church."²⁴

Among the Chalcedonians who resisted Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters we find a notable faction in North Africa. Added to the above arguments based on the perceived affronts to ecclesiastical norms

imperatorum, pontificum, aliorum inde ab. a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae, Avellana quae dicitur collectio, part 1, *Prolegomena, epistolae I–CIV*, CSEL 35 (Prague, 1895), 296:18–25: "we are making the greatest possible provision by the enactment of our present decree to ensure, as we said above, that there be no disparagement of persons who went to their rest in the peace and communion of the universal church on the basis of this our condemnation of perverse doctrine, but that, now that the execrable doctrines in [*sic*] the heresiarchs Nestorius and Eutyches and all their followers have been condemned, no contumely should result for those priests who, as has been said, died in the peace of the catholic church" (trans. Price, *Council of Constantinople*, 2:194).

21 Pope Vigilius, *Constitutum de tribus capitulis*, §§204–7, 286–88. I discuss Cyril's letter to John in further detail below.

22 The entire episode is transmitted in the Ephesian acts: *Gesta Ephesina, Actio VI* (CPG 8721), *Collectio Atheniensis* 73–76, *ACO* 1.1.7, 84–117; the creed can be found in 97:25–100:4 (trans. in Price and Graumann, *Council of Ephesus* [n. 1 above], 444–85). For a detailed discussion of this incident, see F. Millar, "Repentant Heretics in Fifth-Century Lydia: Identity and Literacy," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23 (2004): 111–30.

23 This part of the letter is quoted in Vigilius, *Constitutum de tribus capitulis*, §207, 288:9–12.

24 Vigilius, *Constitutum de tribus capitulis*, §207, 288:1–4 (trans. Price, *Council of Constantinople*, 2:187).

17 R. Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553, with Related Texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, 2 vols., TTH 51 (Liverpool, 2009), 1:76–98.

18 For the Chalcedonian sessions concerning the reinstatement of Theodoret and Ibas, see Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon*, 2:250–309.

19 For an example, see below, n. 25. For further references to Chalcedonian authors who expressed this sentiment, see Straw, "Much Ado about Nothing," 130–31.

20 Pope Vigilius, *Epistola LXXXIII: Constitutum de tribus capitulis*, §§234–35, *Collectio Avellana*, in O. Günther, ed., *Epistulae*

and the integrity of Chalcedon,²⁵ we find complaints among some Africans on the improper involvement of the emperor in the affairs of their local church.²⁶ This argument corresponds well with contemporary local sentiments regarding Byzantine rule in North Africa. Following the Byzantine reconquest of North Africa in 533–34 and the liberation of its population from the Vandals who had held the region since the previous century, Justinian quickly incorporated the territory into the administrative structure of empire. But the return of North Africa back into the Byzantine fold came at a price: the end of the region's local administrative independence, which flourished throughout the Vandal period. Under the new Byzantine regime, Africa was to be administered by representatives of a faraway court in Constantinople at the expense of local African notables.²⁷ And with Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters, the Africans were discouraged to learn that the faraway court was eager to involve itself not only in their local administrative affairs but also in ecclesiastical matters.

A related problem that the Africans found in the doctrinal request at their doorstep was simply that they were not familiar enough with the teachings of Theodore, Ibas, and Theodoret. African clerics even explicitly raised this problem in their communications with Justinian.²⁸ Gradually, however, certain Africans took upon themselves the challenge of investigating the complexities surrounding the lives and teachings

of the Three Chapters. Among the most notable surviving works on the subject are Liberatus of Carthage's *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* and Facundus of Hermiane's *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*.²⁹ As I will demonstrate below, the *Collectio Sichardiana* should also be counted among the African scholarly investigations into the controversy with which Theodore, Ibas, and Theodoret had been involved.

Reconstructing the *Collectio Sichardiana*

In this section I will review the three sources that transmit the *Sichardiana*. Since the collection has survived fragmentarily in three different sources, a deeper understanding of the scholarly objectives and editorial principles that shaped these sources may explain why no source transmits the *Sichardiana* in full. While much more can be said about each of the collection's three sources (on which scholarship is severely lacking), the chief goal of this section will be to highlight some of the shared structural ways in which the *Sichardiana* documents were chosen, arranged, and copied in the three sources, particularly in the late sixth-century Verona LIX (57). As I will show in the following pages, the deep embeddedness of the *Sichardiana* in Verona LIX (57) will offer us the first evidence for the collection's late antique provenance.

Before we continue it should be noted that the most accessible version of the *Collectio Sichardiana* can be found in Eduard Schwartz's *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (henceforth *ACO*; see Appendix I).³⁰ An important aspect of the *ACO*, which we should keep in mind before delving into its rich documentary contents, is that rather than being a critical edition of conciliar documents, the work is first and foremost a critical edition of late antique and medieval *collections* of conciliar documents. Schwartz's efforts to reconstruct conciliar collections were chiefly motivated by his realization that in order to understand the great

25 E.g., Fulgentius Ferrandus, *Epistola VI: Ad Pelagium et Anatolium Diaconos urbis Romae*, PL 67, 923: *Totum concilium Chalcedonense, cum est totum concilium Chalcedonense, verum est: nulla pars illius habet ullam reprehensionem; quidquid ibi dictum, gestum, iudicatum novimus atque firmatum, sancti Spiritus operata est ineffabilis et secreta potentia*, and Ferrandus, *Epistola VI*, PL 67, 925: *Quid erit firmum, si quod statuit Chalcedonense concilium vocatur in dubium?*

26 R. Eno, "Doctrinal Authority in the African Ecclesiology of the Sixth Century: Ferrandus and Facundus," *REAug* 22 (1976): 101–2.

27 A. Cameron, "Byzantine Africa: The Literary Evidence," in *Excavations at Carthage 1978, Conducted by the University of Michigan*, vol. 7, ed. J. H. Humphrey (Ann Arbor, 1982), 45, and J. Conant, *Staying Roman: Conquest and Identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439–700* (Cambridge, 2012), 196–251.

28 E.g., Pontianus, *Ep. ad Justinianum*, PL 67:996–97: *In extremo itaque epistolae vestrae cognovimus . . . debere nos Theodorum, et scripta Theodreti et epistolam Ibae damnare. Eorum dicta ad nos usque nunc minime pervenerunt. Quod si et pervenerint, et aliqua ibi apocrypha, quae contra fidei regulam dicta sint, legerimus*. See also Y. Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," in Chazelle and Cubitt, *The Crisis of the Oikoumene* (n. 9 above), 44–45.

29 Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," 61, and S. Adamiak, *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome: Imperial and Papal Interventions in the Life of the Church in Byzantine Africa (533–698)* (Rome, 2016), 86. See also Liberatus's words from his introduction: Libératus de Carthage, *Abrégé de l'histoire des nestoriens et des eutychiens*, ed. E. Schwartz, trans. F. Cassingena-Trévedy and P. Blauveau, SC 607 (Paris, 2019), 132:11–12: *libenter offero catholicis fratribus ignorantibus acta ipsarum heresum [sic] et legere volentibus*.

30 *ACO* 1.5.2, 247–318.

church councils of the medieval past, it is not enough to investigate the texts documenting the councils themselves. Attention should also be given to the collections that transmit these texts.³¹ The collections can teach us how conciliar documents were received, used, and even abused by interested parties from subsequent generations and, in particular, from subsequent church councils. Schwartz therefore termed those collections *publizistische Sammlungen*, a term highlighting that the various texts within them were not arbitrarily chosen and placed side by side. Rather, the texts were carefully edited into politically and theologically motivated publications assembled to promote the specific objectives of factions of clerics who participated in the Christological controversies of late antiquity and beyond.³² By investigating the origins, purposes, and overarching themes of conciliar collections, scholars could begin to understand how the texts within them were used to promote, to defend, or to contest certain positions in subsequent ecclesiastical and theological disputes. The following analysis of the *Sichardiana* will exemplify such an investigation.

The oldest witness of the *Sichardiana* is Verona LIX (57), a late sixth-century manuscript housed in the Biblioteca Capitolare of Verona, Italy.³³ At first glance, the contribution of this witness seems limited, since only four out of the eighteen documents

of the *Sichardiana* are transmitted in it.³⁴ However, a deeper appreciation of the manuscript's contents provide a slightly different perspective: the key to Schwartz's reconstruction of the *Sichardiana* is a rare and peculiar version of Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Theodoretum* (CPG 5222), which is reconstructed as the fourth document in the collection (henceforth *Coll. Sich.* 4). The document is by far the longest text of the collection. In terms of raw content, its text covers roughly 44 percent of the *Sichardiana* as it is printed in the *ACO* (see Appendix II). Together with the three other *Sichardiana* documents in Verona LIX (57), slightly more than 50 percent of the collection survives in this late sixth-century witness. This does not include several other documents in the manuscript that, as I will argue below, complement the contents of the *Sichardiana* documents and should be considered as additional and hitherto unappreciated parts of the original collection.³⁵ Verona LIX (57), therefore, provides our first hint toward establishing the *Sichardiana*'s terminus ante quem in the late sixth century.

I will give further details on the peculiarities of *Coll. Sich.* 4 below, but for now it will be enough to note that the text is a redacted, expanded, and interpolated version of the original Greek treatise of Cyril's *Contra Theodoretum*. That treatise was translated into Latin perhaps as early as the 430s (i.e., very close to its original date of composition), and by the middle of the sixth century the translation was certainly circulating in the Latin West.³⁶ The version of the treatise in *Coll. Sich.* 4,

31 Eduard Schwartz's *Wissenschaftlicher Lebenslauf* (1932), reprinted in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 2, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur der Hellenen und Römer* (Berlin, 1956), 12–15.

32 Further information on these publishing activities can be found in the prefaces to the different parts and volumes of the *ACO* as well as in E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*, AbhMünch, Phil.-hist.Kl. (Munich, 1934), 262–303. See also E. Schwartz, “Die Kanonessammlungen der alten Reichskirche,” *ZSavKan* 56.25 (1936): 75–76, and P. Blaudeau, “Qu'est-ce que la géo-ecclesiologie? Éléments de définition appliqués à la période tardo-antique (IV^e–VI^e s.),” in *Costellazioni geo-ecclesiali da Costantino a Giustiniano: Dalle chiese principali alle chiese patriarcali*, XLIII Incontro di Studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana (Rome, 2017), 53.

33 A. Spagnolo, *I Manoscritti della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona*, ed. S. Marchi (Verona, 1996), 111, and F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts, im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters* (Graz, 1870), 761–62. Although the above publications stretch the possible dating of the manuscript to the seventh century, in this paper I follow the suggestion of Cuthbert Turner for the late sixth century: C. Turner, “The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons,” *JTS* 3 (1902): 381, n. 1, and “The Verona Manuscripts of Canons: The Theodosian MS. and Its Connection with St. Cyril,” *The Guardian*, 11 December 1895, 1921–20.

34 Throughout the following discussion of the *Sichardiana*'s three sources, the reader is advised to consult Appendix II of this paper, which outlines how the *Sichardiana*'s documents are distributed in them.

35 These are the Chalcedonian acts in fols. 170r–209v, which I discuss below in “A Dialogue between Equals,” and the canonical collection in fols. 216r–255v, which I discuss in “The Beginning of Canonical Codification in North Africa and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57)” and “The *Sichardiana* and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57).” It is also possible that some items from the Christological florilegia segment of the manuscript in fols. 82r–129v were part of the original *Sichardiana*, on which see below, nn. 55–58, 204.

36 The translation has survived in the sixth-century *Collectio Palatina* 40, 142–65, edited in *ACO* 1.5.1. Because the entire collection was misattributed to the early fifth-century author and translator Marius Mercator, scholars still do not agree on exactly which texts can be traced to Marius Mercator himself and which were translated and added later to the collection; further discussion is available

however, represents a different transmission history: its peculiarities do not seem like innovations originating in the Latin West, since we find similar witnesses of this version in Greek medieval manuscripts.³⁷ In the Latin tradition, *Coll. Sich.* 4 has survived solely in the three sources of the *Sichardiana*: besides Verona LIX (57), the treatise is transmitted in the thirteenth-century Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 341 (henceforth Arsenal 341),³⁸ and in Johannes Sichard's printed edition from 1528, titled *Antidotum contra diversas omnium fere seculorum haereses* (henceforth *Antidotum*).³⁹ Unlike the Greek manuscript witnesses of *Coll. Sich.* 4, which transmit it in varying contexts without any notable shared texts between them, the Latin tradition of *Coll. Sich.* 4 surrounds it with the same texts, which are also organized one after the other in similar ways: Verona LIX (57) and Arsenal 341 share *Coll. Sich.* 11 and 12, and in both manuscripts these two documents are presented one after the other; Arsenal 341 and Sichard's *Antidotum* have six documents in common, *Coll. Sich.* 7–10 and 16–17, and, likewise, in

these two sources the documents are presented in the same sequence. *Coll. Sich.* 4 is the only document that survives in all three sources of the *Sichardiana*.

This sharing of documents between the three sources of the *Sichardiana* suggests that we are dealing with a single collection of documents that has survived in a fragmented manner and not independently. It is nevertheless worth asking why the three sources transmit such a fragmented witness of the original collection. I can offer only conjectural answers, because the evidence surrounding the *Sichardiana*'s three sources is limited. However, a deeper familiarity with the contents of the three sources can shed light on some of the editorial features that shaped these sources. And, as we will see in the following pages, one of the most common editorial features identifiable in all three sources of the *Sichardiana* is their tendency not to transmit and preserve their own source materials in their integrity.

Arsenal 341

In its preserved state, Arsenal 341 consists of two distinct manuscripts that were joined into one codex, in which the two underlying manuscripts were further divided into three parts.⁴⁰ Parts one and three of Arsenal 341 are clearly the product of the same scribe, as can be easily recognized in the distinct handwriting and in some repeated stylistic attributes, such as the frequent use of red ink in rubrics and in beginnings of sentences or paragraphs. The contents of parts one and three also exhibit similarities in their choice of seemingly eclectic collections of late ancient texts: part one transmits Latin translations of various texts attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria (some are not genuine),⁴¹ and concludes with an obviously forged

in Schwartz's preface to *ACO* 1.5.1, v–ix, and W. C. Bark, "John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina," *HTR* 36.2 (1943): 93–107.

37 See the eleventh-century Vatican gr. 1431, fols. 66v–98v, reviewed in H.-G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* (Berlin, 1935), 80–81; the twelfth-century Austrian National Library, cod. theol. gr. 40, fols. 76v–95r, reviewed in H. Hunger and O. Kresten, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, vol. 3.1, *Codices theologici 1–100* (Vienna, 1976), 72–78; and the thirteenth-century Athens, Byzantine and Christian Museum (BXM), XAE 760, fols. 111v–136r, reviewed in N. A. Bees, "Κατάλογος των χειρογράφων κωδίκων της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας Αθηνών," *Δελτ. Χριστ. Αρχ. Ετ.* 6, B.A. (1906): no. 9, 56–57. The three manuscripts were consulted in Schwartz's editions of Cyril's *Contra Theodoretum* (*ACO* 1.1.6, 110–46) and his *Contra Orientales* (*ACO* 1.1.7, 33–65), and are normally referred to as AWR or witnesses of recension Ψ.

38 H. Martin, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1885), 206–8. Martin dated the manuscript to the fifteenth century, yet Schwartz, while referring to Martin's catalog, continuously highlighted its thirteenth-century hand: see E. Schwartz, *Konzilstudien*, *Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg*, vol. 20 (Strassburg, 1914), 57, and his preface to *ACO* 1.5.2, ii. The manuscript is actually composed of two distinct manuscripts that were later combined into one codex (for more on this, see below, "Arsenal 341"). Although both might have been composed in the same scriptorium, the stark differences between the two in script and contents suggest the possibility of different dates of composition.

39 Johannes Sichard, *Antidotum contra diversas omnium fere seculorum haereses* (Basel, 1528).

40 In its preserved state at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, the codex's folios are numbered rather confusingly: part one goes from fol. 1r to fol. 113r; part two, from fol. 1r to fol. 84r; but part three, from fol. 85r to 133v. When citing texts from the manuscript, I will therefore also indicate their corresponding part.

41 Most notably, the Pseudo-Athanasian *De Trinitate*. In part 1, fols. 40v–63v, Arsenal 341 transmits books 1–7 of the work's so-called first recension, together with book 8, which according to the scholarly consensus had a different author from the previous books. A recent and very useful study of this highly contested work and its rich scholarship is available in J. Kwon, "A Theological Investigation of the *De Trinitate* Attributed to Eusebius of Vercelli" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011). I wish to thank Dr. Kwon for sharing his work with me.

letter of Pope Mark (336) to Athanasius;⁴² part three consists of the twelve *Sichardiana* documents (*Coll. Sich.* 4, 7–17), which are followed by one additional document that concludes the manuscript—a letter by the founder of the Carthusian order, Bruno of Cologne (d. 1101), to Raoul le Verd, which notably deviates from the late ancient provenance of all previous texts.⁴³ In contrast to the similarities between parts one and three of Arsenal 341, part two exhibits some unique features, most notably in its script. Unlike parts one and three, which display a bold, cursive, and, at times, almost illegible hand, part two shows a much thinner, clearer, and more carefully and regularly written script, which almost gives the impression that we are dealing with a printed text. In addition, as opposed to the assortment of texts of parts one and three, part two transmits only a single text: Augustine’s *De consensu evangelistarum libri quattuor*.⁴⁴ It certainly seems like all three parts were intentionally distinguished as distinct segments by their copyists, as we can learn from the decorative script in the rubrics found in the first folios of each part. Lastly, the survival of two brief colophons suggests that all three parts originated in the community of canons regular from Val Saint-Martin, Leuven; no further details, such as the scribe’s name or the date of completion, are included.⁴⁵ Schwartz dated the manuscript to the thirteenth century.⁴⁶

The fragmented manner of Arsenal 341’s survival makes it difficult to reconstruct the underlying editorial vision behind its three parts. It is clear, however, that as a whole Arsenal 341 is dedicated to patristic texts written hundreds of years before the manuscript’s completion. It is also notable that part three of the manuscript transmits twelve *Sichardiana* documents, eleven of them in an uninterrupted sequence (*Coll. Sich.* 7–17, as

well as *Coll. Sich.* 4). With our current limited understanding of the manuscript’s history, we cannot really tell whether other *Sichardiana* documents are missing due to an intentional decision not to copy them or due to a damaged source. It is nevertheless fortunate that the manuscript transmits a relatively high degree of integrity of the original collection in the uninterrupted sequence. And together with *Coll. Sich.* 4, Arsenal 341 offers, in terms of raw content, roughly 75 percent of the collection as it is printed in the *ACO* (see Appendix II).

Sichard’s Antidotum

Like Arsenal 341, Sichard’s *Antidotum* also transmits twelve *Sichardiana* documents (although not the same ones: the *Antidotum* offers *Coll. Sich.* 1–10 and 16–17), ten of which seem to have survived in their original sequence (*Coll. Sich.* 1–10). In terms of raw content, we are dealing here with over 88 percent of the collection as it is printed in the *ACO*. But unlike the two other manuscript sources of the *Sichardiana*, the *Antidotum* is a printed edition that was assembled with relative care for a very specific aim. As we can quickly learn from its bombastic title (roughly translated as “Antidote against the different heresies of nearly all ages”), as well as its index, table of contents, and dedicatory introduction to the king of Poland, Sigismund I (r. 1506–1548),⁴⁷ Sichard’s overt intention was to gather patristic texts concerned with refuting past heresies. In the segment of the *Antidotum* dedicated to the works of Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus of Constantinople (434–46) against the heresy of Nestorius, we find *Coll. Sich.* 1–10 and 16–17 presented consecutively. Even though this section of the *Antidotum* is dedicated to the works of Cyril and Proclus against Nestorius,⁴⁸ some of the texts in this sequence of documents are attributed to other authors such as John of Antioch (*Coll. Sich.* 5–6), Theodoret of Cyrillus (the third introductory letter of *Coll. Sich.* 4), Dionysius Exiguus (*Coll. Sich.* 7, 16), and even Nestorius himself (*Coll. Sich.* 2–3). For the suspicious reader, the range of authorship is the first hint that this section of the *Antidotum* is not merely a collected anthology of texts by Cyril and Proclus.

Sichard did not leave behind any information on the manuscripts or libraries from which he had gathered any of the texts edited in his *Antidotum*. However,

42 Arsenal 341, part 1, fols. 111r–112v. The letter is edited in PG 28, 1445 (cf. *CPG* 2292). See also C. Müller, “Das Phänomen des lateinischen Athanasius,” in *Von Arius zum Athanasianum: Studien zur Edition der “Athanasius Werke,”* ed. A. von Stockhausen and H. C. Brennecke (Berlin, 2010), 29–30, n. 107, and F. Hurst, *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen: Von ihrem Auftauchen bis in die neuere Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1972), 186.

43 Arsenal 341, part 3, fols. 131r–135r.

44 See J.-M. Roessli, “*De consensu evangelistarum*,” in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, ed. K. Pollman et al. (Oxford, 2013), 261–66.

45 Arsenal 341, part 1, fol. 114r, and part 2, fol. 84r.

46 See above, n. 38.

47 Sichard, *Antidotum*, fols. a4r–γ5v, a1v, and a2r–a3v, respectively.

48 As confirmed also in the table of contents (fol. a1v).

the relatively rich information we have about Sichard's life and scholarly endeavors have made him and his numerous scholarly editions indispensable in many modern discussions of the philological and transmission history of a wide range of classical and medieval texts.⁴⁹ Together with the distinct similarities between the sequence of the documents in the *Antidotum*'s segment dedicated to Cyril's and Proclus's texts and the documents we find in Arsenal 341 and Verona LIX (57), it certainly seems that Sichard did not merely edit and arrange these documents according to his own vision, but kept some measure of integrity of the original collection upon which he relied.

The transmission of the *Sichardiana* documents in the *Antidotum* is nevertheless fragmentary. We can therefore still ask why that is so. In contrast to Arsenal 341, about whose underlying editorial vision we have very little information, the overly anti-Nestorian sentiment of the segment where Sichard edited the *Sichardiana* documents can help explain why *Coll. Sich.* 11–15 and 18 were not edited into the *Antidotum*. As we will see in greater detail below, all these documents are barely focused on Nestorius at all—most notably *Coll. Sich.* 11–12, which cover the Christological middle ground between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch; *Coll. Sich.* 13, which is a letter by Cyril from 419 that precedes the Nestorian Controversy by a decade; and *Coll. Sich.* 14–15, which deal with Theodore of Mopsuestia's teachings. We can therefore hypothesize that in his attempt to maintain the segment of the *Antidotum* focused on Nestorius, Sichard saw no issue with leaving out texts that have very little to do with Nestorius.

Verona LIX (57)

The oldest source of the *Sichardiana* is a damaged manuscript whose beginning and ending have not survived.

49 A short biography composed by his contemporary Conrad von Humbracht tells us that sometime in the 1520s, Sichard, then a teacher of rhetoric who specialized in Latin authors from the Roman period, obtained from the archduke of Austria and future emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, Ferdinand I (1503–1564), a grant that gave him access to monastic libraries in Germany. Drawing on the manuscripts consulted during this research, Sichard published numerous editions of ancient and medieval texts: P. Lehmann, *Iohannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften* (Munich, 1911), 17–23, and 46–48 for some examples of Sichard's contributions to the field of philology.

Neither a colophon nor any other explicit indication of the date of the manuscript's composition has survived in Verona LIX (57). The manuscript's dating to the late sixth century is based solely on its contents and the early medieval half-uncial script in which it was written: both its script and assortment of contents exhibit similarities with other early medieval manuscripts in the Biblioteca Capitolare and suggest that the manuscript was copied in Verona itself.⁵⁰ Despite its fragmentary nature, the surviving manuscript is very long, with 255 legible folios, each of roughly 25 lines. The manuscript's length, its rich and diverse contents, and the peculiar versions of some of its documents make it quite challenging to catalog. Although Antonio Spagnolo's early twentieth-century catalog of the Biblioteca Capitolare's manuscripts was reissued and revised in 1996,⁵¹ scholarship has improved tremendously in terms of the available editions, translations, and research of numerous documents transmitted in Verona LIX (57). Providing a detailed review of each document of the manuscript would go beyond the confines of this paper, but I will dedicate several discussions here to the wider documentary context of Verona LIX (57) insofar as it relates to the contents of the *Sichardiana*. A brief overview of the manuscript's outline will therefore benefit our attempt to understand why the *Sichardiana* is transmitted in such a fragmentary manner among its folios.

In its preserved state without its opening and close, Verona LIX (57) transmits thirty-five documents, beginning with document number 22 and ending with document number 57.⁵² The order of presentation of

50 E. A. Lowe, ed., *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*, 12 vols. (Oxford, 1934–71) (henceforth *CLA*), 4: no. 509, and below, n. 206.

51 Spagnolo, *I Manoscritti della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona* (n. 33 above).

52 The manuscript starts in the middle of a text whose rubric has not survived. The rubric of the next document, found in fol. 3r, numbers it as the 23rd document. The manuscript breaks in the middle of the 57th document. In Spagnolo's catalog of Verona LIX (57), we find 91 rubrics of separate texts, but this does not follow the manuscript's own division of documents. Confusingly enough, Spagnolo's catalog enumerates the texts in Latin numbers, which gives the impression that these 91 rubrics originate in the manuscript itself. Although the catalog's careful attention to detail could be helpful in highlighting additional documents that may hide under a single rubric, it also significantly deviates from how the manuscript itself is divided. For example, the version of Cyril's *Contra Theodoretum* (*Coll. Sich.* 4) is divided into four rubrics in the manuscript (docs. 26–29; see below, n. 54), but in the catalog, it

these documents seems to correspond to three main thematic segments according to which the manuscript was divided: The first segment (fols. 11r–11v, docs. 22–25) offers texts dealing with orthodox and heterodox creeds mainly as they pertain to Trinitarian theology.⁵³ The second segment (fols. 12r–129v, docs. 26–38) covers detailed Christological discussions, which can be further divided into two parts: the *Sichardiana* section of the manuscript (fols. 12v–82r, docs. 26–32), which I will review in detail below,⁵⁴ and the second part (fols. 82r–129v; docs. 33–38) offering relevant florilegia on matters pertaining to the divinity and humanity of Christ, among which we find florilegia read at the

is divided into 53 rubrics: each of Cyril's twelve anathemas—as well as Cyril's explanation of each anathema, refutation by Theodoret (or by the *Orientalis*, when interpolated), and following rebuttal by Cyril—is enumerated as a separate text in the catalog.

53 We start in fols. 11r–31r with a fragment of book 10 of the Pseudo-Athanasian *De Trinitate*. The fragment here was consulted in Pseudo-Athanasius, *De Trinitate, libri X–XII*, ed. M. Simonetti (Bologna, 1956), 36:5–39:18. The following document's rubric is *XXIII Incipit scī Athanasi [sic] de symbolo* (fols. 31r–71r), which is a unique text that includes citations of the Apostles' Creed. See *CPL* 174.4a, and L. H. Westra, *The Apostle's Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries* (Turnhout, 2002), 351–61, 459–65. The next two items, which conclude the manuscript's credal segment, are unique witnesses of book 6 of the Pseudo-Athanasian *De Trinitate*. Their rubric is *XXIV Inc fides scī Athanasi* (fols. 71r–101r), and *XXV Item de variis generibus leprarum* [sc. *leprarum*] (fols. 101r–111v). The division of book 6 into two rubrics may provide further proof of the editorial liberties taken by the manuscript's compiler (discussed in the following notes and sections of this paper). However, the division of book 6 into two rubrics also follows the inherent structure of the book's content and may suggest that our compiler was a careful reader. On book 6's structure, see Kwon, “Theological Investigation,” 47–48.

54 The segment is divided into seven documents: *XXVI Inc epistula scī Cyrilli epī Alexandriae ad Eyoptyum epīm ad ea quae a Theodorito epō Cyri dicta sunt contra XII anathemata* (fols. 12r–13v), *XXVII Inc praefatio scī Cyrilli epī Alexandrini in interpretatione XII capitulorum in epistula ad Nestorium scriptam* [sic] (fols. 13v–15r), *XXVIII Inc scī Theodoriti epī Cyri civitatis ad scīm Iohannem epīm Antiochenum epistula, in qua ostendit se scripsisse contra XII capitula beati Cyrilli* (fols. 15r–16v), *XXVIII Inc anathematismus primus scī Quirilli* [sic] (fols. 16v–73r), *XXX Inc adlocutio beatissimi Pauli quae praesente Quirillo in Alexandria facta est, per quem beatissimus Iohannis ad scaē memoriae Quirillum unitiuam de pace direxit epistulam* (fols. 73r–76v), *XXXI Inc beati Quirilli adlocutio quam in ecclesia fecit post adlocutionem beati Pauli Emeseni ubi dicta eius adfirmat* (fols. 76v–77v), and *XXXII Inc epistula scīssimi Theodoriti epī Cyri ad Dioscorum Alexandrinum post primam ante secundum Ephesenam* (fols. 77v–81v).

Councils of Ephesus (431)⁵⁵ and Chalcedon (451),⁵⁶ as well as a few sets of florilegia attributed to Augustine, although some include citations from other authors⁵⁷ or nongenuine Augustinian works.⁵⁸ The third and

55 *XXXIII Incipiunt testimonia scōrum patrum quae in synodo confirmata sunt de actione prima* (fols. 82r–90r). The version here is actually not from the first session but from the one known as the sixth, which convened on 22 July 431 (see *CPG* 8721). For the Greek original, see *ACO* 1.1.7, 89:26–95:18; trans. in Price and Graumann, *Council of Ephesus* (n. 1 above), 448–57. Further Latin translations of the florilegium can be found in *ACO* 1.3, 121:25–127; *ACO* 1.5.1, 89:26–96:2; and *ACO* 2.3.1, 196:10–210, as well as an abbreviated Latin version in *ACO* 2.2.1, 74:35–75:37.

56 Verona LIX (57) offers two florilegia from Chalcedon. The first was read at the end of the council as part of a special address to Emperor Marcian (*CPG* 9021): *XXXIII Incipiunt testimonia scōrum patrum qui duas naturas in Xpō confessi sunt consubstantiali patri Dm Verbum etiam nobis secundum carnem ex Maria consubstantiali veraciter adserentes* (fols. 90r–92v). For the Greek original, see *ACO* 2.1.3, 114[473]:4–116[475]:12. A Latin translation is edited in *ACO* 2.3.3, 119[558]:18–122[561]:12; trans. in Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon* (n. 15 above), 3:117–20. The second florilegium is the one appended to the well-known Tome of Leo (on this text, see below, n. 64): *XXXVII Incipiunt exempla catholica beatissimorum patrum de incarnatione dñi et saluatoris nostri Ihū Xpi quae in scā et venerabili Chalcedonensi [sic] synodo confirmata sunt adversum Nestorianos et Eutyrianos adque hereticos [sic]* (fols. 96v–104v). The Augustinian citations in the Tome's florilegium were separated to the next rubric and can be found in fols. 104v–105v. In general, the transmission history of the florilegium is very unstable and includes different arrangements of the patristic citations (see the critical apparatus in *ACO* 2.4, 119–31). The Greek version as it was read in the council is edited in *ACO* 2.1.1, 20:6–25:6.

57 *XXXV Inc de incarnatione et passione vel resurrectione dñi nī Ihū Xpi scī Augustini* (fols. 93r–96r). Antoine Chavasse demonstrated in 1966 that this text, which scholars until then had identified as a Pseudo-Augustinian sermon, is in fact an elaborate patristic florilegium in which the citations, presented in continuous and uninterrupted series, are not attributed to their original authors. The work includes citations from a wide range of patristic authorities, including Vincent of Lérins, Pope Leo I, Leporius, Augustine, Gennadius of Massilia, Cyril of Alexandria, Philastrius of Brescia, the Pseudo-Athanasian *De Trinitate*, and the Apostles' Creed. The text is edited in A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1852), 391–93. See A. Chavasse, “Un curieux centon christologique du VI^e siècle,” *Revue de droit canonique* 16 (1966): 87–97.

58 The bulk of Augustinian florilegia in the manuscript is organized under one rubric: *XXXVIII Item beatissimi Augustini epī et confessoris Hypponi Regiensium de duabus naturis in una dñi nī Ihū Xpi persona* (fols. 104v–129v). The contents under this rubric can be divided into three parts: Part one (fols. 104v–105v) includes dyophysite Augustinian citations from Leo's Tome (see above, n. 56, and below, n. 64). Part two (fols. 105v–117r) offers nine extracts from authentic works of Augustine that also deal with Christ's two natures. Part 3 (fols. 117v–129v) consists of four brief sermons interspersed

last segment of the manuscript (fols. 129v–255v, docs. 39–57) focuses on ecclesiastical norms and regulations through canonical collections,⁵⁹ conciliar acts,⁶⁰ sermons concerning pastoral duties,⁶¹ questions and answers regarding ecclesiastical discipline,⁶² and papal

with comments pertaining to Christology and Trinitarian theology. According to Cyrille Lambot, the four sermons of part 3 should not be attributed to Augustine (“Le florilège augustinien de Vérone,” *RBén* 79.1–2 [1969]: 70–81). The four sermons nevertheless exhibit a unique style of their own, suggesting that they should be attributed to a single author. Part 3, because it offers four stand-alone sermons rather than providing brief citations in the form of a florilegium, diverges from the florilegia that precede it in the manuscript. But the sermons’ strong emphases on Christological matters conveniently fit this segment of the manuscript: the four sermons conclude the Christological segment of the manuscript and creatively lead us to the next segment, where we will find six more sermons from the same Pseudo-Augustinian author, though with a focus on clerics’ pastoral duties. These six sermons, therefore, shift the theme of the manuscript from matters of Christology to matters of ecclesiastical norms and regulations.

59 These are reviewed below, in “The Beginning of Canonical Codification in North Africa and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57)” and “The *Sichardiana* and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57).” The rubrics are *LII Incipiunt canones ecclesiae seu statutae concilii Nicaeni in quo fuerunt ep̄ CCCXVIII* (fols. 216r–234r), *LIII In̄ concilium sive synodus apud Ancyra* (fols. 234r–240r), *LIIII In̄ concilium Novecaesariensis* (fols. 240r–242r), *LV In̄ canones Gangrenses* (fols. 242v–247r), *LVI In̄ concilium Antiochenum* (fols. 247r–254r), and *LVII Incipiunt regulae sive definitiones secundum Laodiciam Phrygiae Pagatiana* (fols. 254r–255v).

60 These are reviewed below, in “A Dialogue between Equals.” The rubrics are *XLVII In̄ actio octava sc̄i synodi Calchedonensis de sc̄o Theodorito* (fols. 170r–174r), *XLVIII In̄ actio nona* (fols. 174r–178v), and *XLVIII In̄ actio decima* (ff. 178v–209v).

61 These are the six sermons—by the same Pseudo-Augustinian author of part 3 of doc. 38—that I mentioned in the end of n. 58 above and that Lambot analyzed in his “Le florilège augustinien.” The rubrics are *XXXVIII Item eiusdem omelia de eo quod neofitis ex oleo sc̄o aures a sacerdotibus et nares inliniantur* (fols. 129v–134r), edited in PL 40:1207–10; *XL Item eiusdem de mysterio et sc̄itate baptismatis* (fols. 134r–139r), edited in PL 40:1209–12; *XLI Item eiusdem de huncio capitis et de pedibus labandis* (fols. 139r–142v), edited in PL 40:1212–14; *XLII Item eiusdem ubi post baptismum spes paenitentiae concessa est* (fols. 142v–146r); edited in Mai, *Nova*, 385–87; *XLIII Item eiusdem de paenitentiae* (fols. 146r–149v), edited in Mai, *Nova*, 387–89; and *XLIII Item eiusdem de resurrectione carnis et vivorum et mortuorum iudicii xp̄ianorum fides* (fols. 149v–152v), edited in Mai, *Nova*, 389–91.

62 From the letter of Pope Leo to Rusticus, the bishop of Narbonne (*ep.* 167; PL 54:1197–1209). The letter is divided into two rubrics in the manuscript: under the first we find the letter itself and under the second a series of questions and answers: *L Leo ep̄s Rustico ep̄o Narbonensi* (fols. 210r–211v); *LI Incipiunt inquisitiones de praesbyteris vel diacones qui se episcopus esse mentiti sunt et de his quos clericos*

letters that deal, in one way or another, with Rome’s prerogative in arbitrating ecclesiastical disputes.⁶³

The compiler of Verona LIX (57) arranged the manuscript into different thematic segments and parts either by choosing independent works that fit their thematic surroundings or by dividing the same work into different rubrics, parts, or thematic segments.⁶⁴ The approach suggests that the manuscript’s compiler did not merely copy groups of texts indiscriminately but gave careful thought to the manuscript’s contents and their arrangement. Appreciating the editorial liberties taken by the compiler of Verona LIX (57) may help explain why it transmits the *Sichardiana* in such a fragmented way: as several texts transmitted in the manuscript demonstrate, the compiler of Verona LIX (57) chose from the original *Sichardiana* only documents that fit the manuscript’s editorial vision. Like Sichard in his *Antidotum*,

ordinarunt (fols. 211v–215v). For a recent critical edition of the letter, see M. Hoskin, “Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Letters of Pope Leo the Great: A Study of the Manuscripts” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2015), 337–58, 434–35.

63 The first is Leo’s Tome (on which see below, n. 64): *XLV In̄ epistula Leonis papae ad Flavianum ep̄m Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae* (fols. 152v–162v). The second papal letter is Pope Innocent I’s (401–417) letter to the bishops in Illyricum (*ep.* 17; PL 20:526–37): *XLVI Innocentius · Rufo · Eusebio · Eustasio · Claudio · Maximo · Eugenio · Gerontio · Iohanni · Polycronio · Sofronio · Flaviano · Hilario · Machedonio · Calicrati · Zosimo · Profuturo · Nicite · Hermogeni · Vincentio · Asiologo · Terentiano · Herodiano · et Marciano ep̄s Machedonibus et Dacie in dn̄o salutem* (fols. 162v–169v). For a detailed discussion of this letter, see G. D. Dunn, “Innocent I and the Illyrian Churches on the Question of Heretical Ordination,” *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 4 (2008): 65–81. See also Dunn, “The Church of Rome as a Court of Appeal in the Early Fifth Century: The Evidence of Innocent I and the Illyrian Churches,” *JEH* 64.4 (2013): 679–99.

64 I will review two examples of this below in “A Dialogue between Equals” and “The *Sichardiana* and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57).” For an example from the first segment of the manuscript (docs. 24–25), see above, n. 53. The clearest editorial example, however, is the manuscript’s treatment of the well-known Tome of Leo, i.e., Pope Leo I’s letter to Flavian of Constantinople, dated 17 June 449 (*ep.* 28; *CPG* 8922; *ACO* 2.2.1, 24:16–33:10). The Tome and its appended florilegium were translated into Greek and read and discussed at the Council of Chalcedon during its second session (10 October 451) and its fourth (17 October 451). In Verona LIX (57), the Tome’s florilegium is divided into two documents (docs. 37 and 38), which occur in the Christological florilegia section of the manuscript (see above, n. 56). Forty-seven folios later, the actual Tome occurs as doc. 45, in the third segment of the manuscript concerning ecclesiastical norms and regulations (see above, n. 63). For further details on Leo’s Tome and its florilegium, see Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon*, 2:14–24, 3:161–62.

our compiler too might have left out any document from the original *Sichardiana* that diverged from the intense Christological discussions in the manuscript's second thematic segment (fols. 121–129v; docs. 26–38).

A deeper understanding of the manuscript's editorial vision may also clarify why the *Sichardiana* documents transmitted in it closely complement other documents in the manuscript despite being separated from them by different rubrics, parts, or segments. But before we will be able to appreciate the relation of the *Sichardiana* to other documents of Verona LIX (57), it will be necessary to understand in more detail the *Sichardiana*'s actual contents. In the following pages, I wish to explore some of the ways in which the collection constructs the theological dispute that gave rise to the Three Chapters Controversy. An appreciation of how the *Sichardiana* constructs the controversy will help in demonstrating the conceptual unity of the collection's documents, the late antique provenance of their assembly, and even the geographical background of their editor.

A Dialogue between Equals

The starting point of my analysis will be the fourth document of the collection, *Coll. Sich.* 4. The document, as already mentioned, is transmitted in all three sources of the *Sichardiana* and represents the bulk of the collection. *Coll. Sich.* 4's towering role in the collection is due not only to its length but also to its main themes, which reverberate throughout the entire collection and which we will continue to encounter throughout this paper. In this section, I will especially focus on the rubrics of the individual segments of *Coll. Sich.* 4, as well as the correspondence of these rubrics to others throughout the *Sichardiana*. Attention to the collection's rubrics will demonstrate one way in which its editor tried to frame the dispute as it is reported in the *Sichardiana* documents. As I will show in the following pages, the collection's careful definition of the competing sides of the dispute was the first editorial step toward presenting a coherent apologetic argument in favor of the Three Chapters. And according to this apologetic argument, the original dispute between Cyril of Alexandria and the "Antiochenes," as members of John of Antioch's faction in Ephesus are normally known in scholarship,⁶⁵ was

not between an orthodox father and his heretical rivals but rather between equally orthodox theologians.

The core text around which *Coll. Sich.* 4 was constructed is Cyril's *Contra Theodoretum* (CPG 5222), a detailed apologetic treatise written in response to Theodoret of Cyrrihus's refutation of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*.⁶⁶ Both Theodoret's refutations and Cyril's apology were published some months before the Council of Ephesus gathered in the summer of 431.⁶⁷ During roughly the same period before the council, Cyril wrote another apology in response to a refutation attributed to multiple anonymous authors from the ecclesiastical province of Oriens; hence the treatise is known as the *Contra Orientales* (CPG 5221).⁶⁸ In the late summer of 431, during the ecumenical proceedings in Ephesus, Cyril wrote a third apologetic treatise, known as the *Explanatio XII Capitulum* (CPG 5223).⁶⁹ All three apologetic treatises are well attested in the Greek, Latin, and Syriac manuscript traditions and normally appear as separate works. In *Coll. Sich.* 4, however, the three treatises are combined into one text.

What could be the purpose of combining the three treatises as they are presented in *Coll. Sich.* 4? An immediate answer that comes to mind is an educational purpose: the text, which offers highly detailed explanations from both Cyril and some of his most sophisticated challengers, could greatly benefit any student interested in understanding this complicated

designation "Antiochenes" is more frequently used in scholarship: A. M. Schor, "Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch': A Network Approach," *JEChrSt* 15.4 (2007): 522–26, and Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition* (n. 7 above), 1:414–37. See also Cyril's reference to this collective as his "Antiochene brothers," cited below, n. 115.

66 Theodoret's original refutation has survived only in Cyril's *Contra Theodoretum*: Cyril of Alexandria, *Apologia XII anathematismorum contra Theodoretum* (CPG 5222), *Collectio Vaticana* 167–69, *ACO* 1.1.6, 110–46. For further details on this treatise, see Daniel King's introduction to Cyril of Alexandria, *Three Christological Treatises*, trans. King, Fathers of the Church 129 (Washington, DC, 2014), 3–32.

67 King, introduction to Cyril, *Three Christological Treatises*, 6–8.

68 Cyril of Alexandria, *Apologia XII capitulum contra Orientales* (CPG 5221), *Collectio Atheniensis* 2.4, *ACO* 1.1.7, 33–65; dated in P. Evieux, "André de Samosate: Un adversaire de Cyrille d'Alexandrie durant la crise nestorienne," *REB* 32 (1974): 267–69.

69 Cyril of Alexandria, *Explanatio XII capitulum* (CPG 5223), *Collectio Vaticana* 148, *ACO* 1.1.5, 15–25. The treatise's rubric places its composition in the context of the conciliar proceedings in Ephesus. It is likely that Cyril wrote it in July while he was under house arrest (Bevan, *New Judas* [n. 4 above], 186).

65 Although the surviving sources more commonly refer to this collective as the *Orientales* (or Ἀνατολικοί), for various reasons the

theological controversy. It is therefore not surprising to find *Coll. Sich.* 4 placed early in the *Sichardiana*, a collection of documents that attempted to make sense of the controversy. But if we look beyond the actual contents and examine how the different treatises were joined and framed, we can identify another layer of meaning embedded in *Coll. Sich.* 4 that reverberates throughout other documents of the *Sichardiana*: as we read through the text, one strong impression we get is that the dispute is constructed not as a battle between an orthodox teacher and his rival dissidents but rather as a dialogue between equals.

Coll. Sich. 4 begins with a sequence of three introductory letters: two of them (the first and third letters in the sequence) normally preface the original Greek version of *Contra Theodoretum*,⁷⁰ while the third letter originally prefaces Cyril's *Explanatio*.⁷¹ Following the

three introductory letters, the treatise offers detailed discussions of each and every one of Cyril's twelve chapters in a very schematic way: after presenting one of Cyril's twelve chapters, the text offers Theodoret's refutation of that chapter, followed by Cyril's explanation of that chapter (from his *Explanatio*), and concluding with Cyril's response to the points raised in Theodoret's refutation.⁷²

The individual sections that make up the discussion of each of Cyril's chapters become much more revealing when we look at their particular rubrics as they are transmitted in the three sources of *Sichardiana*. In Verona LIX (57), after each chapter of *sanctus Quirillus* [*sic*] is presented, the refutation of none other than *sanctus* or *beatus Theodoretus* follows.⁷³ The clear editorial intervention here, as Theodoret is qualified as *sanctus*, becomes much more noticeable when we look through the manuscript traditions of the *Contra Theodoretum*. Not only does the presentation of Theodoret as *sanctus* occur only in Verona LIX (57), but in the rubrics of his refutations preserved in some Latin and Syriac manuscripts, Theodoret's name is frequently omitted—he is merely referred to as a heretic.⁷⁴ In the manuscript traditions, it is much more common to find references to ἡγίος or *sanctus* Cyril in the rubrics of the treatise, with Theodoret given no special qualifier as either saint or heretic, and this is what we find in Arsenal 341. In the process of preparing Arsenal 341, the

70 The first is Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to Eupotius of Ptolemais* (ep. 84; CPG 5384), *Coll. Sich.* 4, 249–50; Greek in ACO 1.1.6, 110–11. The third is Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Letter to John of Antioch* (ep. 150; CPG 6264), *Coll. Sich.* 4, 251–52; Greek in ACO 1.1.6, 107–8. The three sources of the *Sichardiana* exhibit a slight discrepancy in their transmission of Theodoret's letter to John. In Verona LIX (57), Theodoret's letter (fols. 15r–16v) is immediately followed by Cyril's first anathema (fol. 16v), and then by Theodoret's refutation of the first anathema (fols. 16v–18v). This seems to be the original order of Theodoret's treatise, as we learn from his brief comment about the treatise's structure: *Coll. Sich.* 4, 252:18–20 (for the Greek, see ACO 1.1.6, 108:18–20). In both Arsenal 341 and Sichard's *Antidotum*, however, the last paragraph of Theodoret's letter to John is omitted (see ACO 1.5.2, 252:4–20 [from *ego*] = ACO 1.1.6, 108:2–20 [from ἡγώ]). In addition, in both sources Cyril's first anathema is placed *before* Theodoret's letter and his refutation (fols. 86r–87v in Arsenal 341; fols. 153r–153v in the *Antidotum*). This contrasts with Verona LIX (57), where the first anathema is found *between* Theodoret's letter and his refutation. As Schwartz notes in ACO 1.1.6, 170, variations in the inner arrangement of Theodoret's letter to John are not uncommon in the manuscript tradition, sometimes even resembling what we see in Arsenal 341 and the *Antidotum* (see also E. Schwartz, *Neue Aktenstücke zum ephesinischen Konzil von 431*, AbhMünch, Phil.-hist.Kl. [Munich, 1920], 6). Medieval copyists of Cyril's *Contra Theodoretum* most likely faced an editorial challenge when they tried to extract the relevant piece from Theodoret's text—his refutation—while either shortening or omitting entirely other content. The following eleven anathemas posed no difficulties, since Theodoret's refutations followed each anathema without any digressions. It is also possible that Theodoret's rather harsh words in the omitted paragraph (e.g., referring to the *Twelve Chapters* as αἰρετικὴ κακοδοξία) sat uncomfortably with some medieval readers. The copyist of Verona LIX (57), as we will see in other examples below, did not seem to have had much of an issue with the letter's contents.

71 *Coll. Sich.* 4, 250–51.

72 Even when *Coll. Sich.* 4 includes interpolations from the *Contra Orientales*, the individual rubrics continue to refer to Theodoret as the author of the refutations. In the sections where we would find Theodoret's refutations of the eleventh and twelfth chapters, we find instead the refutations of those chapters from the *Contra Orientales*. Cyril's responses to both refutations also come from the *Contra Orientales*. In addition, Cyril's response to Theodoret's refutation of the tenth chapter contains an interpolation from his response to the refutation of the tenth from the *Contra Orientales*. Further details on these interpolations can be found in Schwartz, *Konzilstudien* (n. 38 above), 57–58.

73 In Verona LIX (57), fols. 22v, 26r, we find *Repraehensio a scō facta Theodorito*; in fols. 32r, 39r, 42v, 45r, 47v, *Repraehensio scī Theodoretī*; and in fols. 49v, 53, 62r, 68r, *Repraehensio beati Theodoretī*.

74 Follow the references to recension ApΣ in the critical apparatus of the treatise in ACO 1.1.6, 107–46, e.g., 116:14. ApΣ refers to Latin (Λ) of the *Collectio Palatina* (p) (edited in ACO 1.5.1; the *Contra Theodoretum* in 142–65), and Syriac (Σ) of British Library, Add. 12,156 (see W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1838*, vol. 2 [London, 1871], 647). In the apparatus of ACO 1.1.6, when Schwartz presents Greek rubrics of Theodoret's refutations from recension ApΣ, he is translating from Syriac.

reader and copyist of the manuscript might have been presented with a difficulty when they encountered in *Coll. Sich.* 4 references to *sanctus* Theodoret, especially next to a figure of the stature of Cyril of Alexandria. But in Sichard's *Antidotum*, neither Cyril nor Theodoret is titled *sanctus*. The removal of such honorifics from other *Sichardiana* documents transmitted in Sichard's *Antidotum* reveals that the change was intentional, perhaps reflecting Sichard's attempt to present his edition of early medieval texts through a prism of impartial scholarship.⁷⁵

Despite the survival of references to Theodoret as *sanctus* only in Verona LIX (57), a similar source of *Coll. Sich.* 4 seems to have dictated the rubrics found in all three sources. Perhaps because of contemporary printing and scholarly standards, Sichard attempted to maintain an unbiased regularity in his rubrics. From the three sources of the *Sichardiana*, his printed *Coll. Sich.* 4 includes the fewest variations: following the presentation of each of Cyril's chapters, the section covering Theodoret's refutation is regularly titled *Theodreti Reprehensio*, that of the following explanation from Cyril as *Cyrelli Interpretatio*, and the discussion of each chapter concludes with *Cyrelli Oppositio*. This is largely the same scheme that we find in the rubrics of *Coll. Sich.* 4 in Arsenal 341 and Verona LIX (57), except the qualifier *sanctus* is added to Cyril in the former, and to both Cyril and Theodoret in the latter. Interestingly enough, when we find a deviation from the *Reprehensio–Interpretatio–Oppositio* scheme, it normally presents itself in all three sources. Thus, in the discussion of the third chapter, Cyril's response to Theodoret's refutation is titled a *Contradictio* in all three sources instead of an *Oppositio*.⁷⁶ In the discussions of the fourth and fifth chapters, instead of an *Interpretatio*, Cyril's explanation of the chapters is titled a *Resolutio* in Verona LIX (57) and Arsenal 341, while Sichard resorts to *Responsio*.⁷⁷ More minor variations in the rubrics, especially between Verona LIX (57) and Arsenal 341, seem to indicate issues related to

reading aloud and copying the source material rather than variations in the source material itself.⁷⁸

Although *sanctus Theodoretus* is found in *Coll. Sich.* 4 only in Verona LIX (57), the phenomenon of defining Theodoret and members of the Antiochene faction as equals to Cyril in their qualifications as *sancti* occurs in other *Sichardiana* texts, even texts transmitted in Arsenal 341. In *Coll. Sich.* 11, there appears an address (*allocutio*) by Paul of Emesa that was presented to Cyril of Alexandria in 432.⁷⁹ Paul had been a member of the Antiochene faction since the Council of Ephesus, and John of Antioch, the leader of the Antiochenes, sent him to Alexandria in 432 to a conference with Cyril in an attempt to conclude the controversy and reach a theological settlement between the factions. The address preserved in *Coll. Sich.* 11 comes from that conference.⁸⁰ In the following document of the *Sichardiana*, *Coll. Sich.* 12, we find Cyril's address in response to Paul of Emesa's.⁸¹ I will further discuss both addresses below, but for now it suffices to note that the two documents have survived in both Verona LIX (57) and Arsenal 341, but not in the Sichard's *Antidotum*.⁸² In Arsenal 341, the rubric of *Coll. Sich.* 11 shares some of the historical circumstances behind Paul of Emesa's address by highlighting that Paul arrived in Alexandria with a letter of none other than *sanctus* John of Antioch.⁸³ In Verona LIX (57), the rubric of *Coll.*

78 For example, *Oppositio* sometimes becomes *Obpositio* or *Abpositio*, or Cyril becomes *Ciril* or *Quirril*. The copyist of Arsenal 341 relied extensively on shortened word forms throughout the entire manuscript, both in the rubrics and in the texts themselves. The notable variations in the occurrences of the word *reprehensio* might shed light on the copyist's possible dysgraphia: except one instance where the word is rendered *reprehensio* (with an *o*), we find very inconsistent use of its shortened word forms—e.g., *rñsionēs* (sc. *reprehensiones*) in fol. 86r, *rephensio* in fol. 86v, *reprehēsio* in fol. 93r, and *reprehē* in fol. 108r. Perhaps in order to avoid this difficult word, the copyist frequently replaced it with *responsio* in the titles of Theodoret's refutations.

79 Paul of Emesa, *Second Homily: About the Nativity* (CPG 6366), *Coll. Sich.* 11, 307:4–309:34.

80 For a detailed review of these negotiations, see Bevan, *New Judas*, 210–26, and especially 217–19 for the role of Paul of Emesa.

81 Cyril of Alexandria, *Third Homily: Response to Paul of Emesa* (CPG 5247), *Coll. Sich.* 12, 310:1–25.

82 Verona LIX (57), fols. 73r–77v (docs. 30–31), and Arsenal 341, part 3, fols. 119r–121r.

83 Arsenal 341, part 3, fol. 119r: *Incipit Pauli Emisceni [sic] ēpla qui ēplam scī Iohīs Antiocheni in Alexādriā deportavit allocutionem fecit in Allexandria [sic] ecclesia maiori sedente et audiente beato Cyrillo, docēs*

75 See another example discussed below, n. 100, where Sichard removed honorifics that are transmitted elsewhere.

76 Verona LIX (57), fol. 28v; Arsenal 341, part 3, fol. 91v; and *Antidotum*, fol. 156r.

77 Verona LIX (57), fols. 34v, 40r; Arsenal 341, part 3, fols. 94r, 96v; and *Antidotum*, fols. 157v, 159r.

Sich. 11 titles both Paul of Emesa and John of Antioch *beatissimi*, but the rubric's phrasing is slightly different from what we find in Arsenal 341.⁸⁴ In *Coll. Sich.* 12, however, both manuscripts present very similar rubrics in which *beatus* Paul is mentioned next to *beatus* Cyril.⁸⁵ A few documents later, in *Coll. Sich.* 15,⁸⁶ we find a letter from Cyril to John of Antioch in which both are titled *beati*.⁸⁷ Arsenal 341 is the only source of the *Sichardiana* that transmits *Coll. Sich.* 15.

The above examples from Arsenal 341 further suggest that the manuscript's underlying source of the *Sichardiana* documents was very similar to the underlying source of the *Sichardiana* documents in Verona LIX (57), the collection's oldest witness. The copyists of both manuscripts usually followed the same rubrics found in that shared source—even, at times, when their shared source referred to members of the Antiochene faction as *beati* or *sancti*. Yet as we have seen in *Coll. Sich.* 4, the copyist of Arsenal 341 was not as consistent as the copyist of Verona LIX (57) in honoring the Antiochenes.⁸⁸

duas naturas in Xpō et nō duas [sc. unam?] debere predicari et impassibilem [sic] credimus deitatem et scārā scturārū dividi voces. The letter by John of Antioch that is mentioned at the beginning of the rubric is probably CPG 6309, edited in *Collectio Atheniensis* 108, *ACO* 1.1.7, 151–55.

84 Verona LIX (57), fol. 73r: XXX *In̄ adlocutio beatissimi Pauli quae praesente Quirillo in Alexandria facta est, per quem beatissimus Iohannis ad scaē memoriae Quirillum unitiuam de pace direxit epistolam.*

85 Verona LIX (57), fol. 76v: XXXI *In̄ beati Quirilli adlocutio quam in ecclesia fecit post adlocutionem beati Pauli Emeseni ubi dicta eius adfirmat; Arsenal 341, part 3, fol. 120v: Incipit beati Cyrilli allocutio in ecclesia ubi allocutoēm beati Pauli Emiseni recapitulans affirmat.*

86 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to John of Antioch (pro Theodoro)* (ep. 91; CPG 5391), *Coll. Sich.* 15, 314:7–315:20.

87 Arsenal 341, part 3, fol. 123v: *Incipit ēpla btī Cyrilli ad btm̄ Iohēm Antiochenū ep̄m et ad sinodū [sic] que sub illo ē cōgregata pro Theodoro.*

88 Even though the honorifics in the *Sichardiana* documents are more frequently found in Verona LIX (57), it is unlikely in my opinion that they are merely a unique contribution by the manuscript's copyist rather than the copyist's faithful reproduction of the source's rubrics. The first piece of evidence is the survival of honorifics also in Arsenal 341, as noted above. Further evidence is the general use of honorifics throughout Verona LIX (57). Although honorifics such as *sanctus* and *beatus* occur frequently even outside the manuscript's Christological segment (e.g., in the rubrics of texts of *scī Athanasii* or *scī Augustini*), both personal names and councils sometimes appear without any honorifics, such as in Pope Leo's documents (docs. 45, 50–51; above, nn. 62–63), Pope Innocent I's (doc. 46; above, n. 63), and in all the councils, including Nicaea, mentioned in the canonical collection that conclude the manuscript (docs. 52–57; above, n. 59).

We can offer only conjectures as to why it is so. Perhaps the notoriety of Theodoret of Cyrrhus as opposed to the relative anonymity of John of Antioch and Paul of Emesa made it easier for the thirteenth-century copyist of Arsenal 341 to remove the honorific titles of the former and retain them for the latter.

In two more places in Verona LIX (57) Theodoret and John of Antioch are titled *sancti*,⁸⁹ and there is a third example that is worth dwelling upon before concluding this section. Roughly ninety folios after the Christological segment of Verona LIX (57) where the *Sichardiana* documents are located, we find a series of three documents containing the acts of the eighth, ninth, and tenth sessions of the Council of Chalcedon.⁹⁰ From the perspective of the Three Chapters Controversy of the following sixth century, these three conciliar sessions are of significant interest, for in them Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa, two of the so-called Chapters, were acquitted of their previous charges and restored to their episcopal sees.⁹¹ In Verona LIX (57), the rubric of the first document in this series of three offers a brief clarification about the session's main order of business: *In̄ actio octava scī synodi Calchedonensis [sic] de scō Theodorito*. The rubrics of the two following documents are very brief and merely mention the sessions' numbers.⁹² As far as I can tell, no other manuscript that transmits the Chalcedonian acts in any form presents Theodoret, in this session or otherwise, as *sanctus*.

The correspondence between the subject of the three Chalcedonian acts in Verona LIX (57) and the overall apologetic themes of the *Sichardiana* documents, as well as the way in which the rubric of the eighth session, like other *Sichardiana* documents,

The latter stands in stark contrast to every document related to the Council of Chalcedon in which it receives the honorific *sancta*.

89 Verona LIX (57), fol. 16v: XXVIII *In̄ scī Theodoriti epī Cyrrī civitatis ad scm̄ Iohannem ep̄m Antiochenum epistula in qua ostendit se scripsisse contra XII capitula beati Cyrilli*, and fol. 77v: XXXII *In̄ epistula scīssimi Theodoriti epī Cyrrī ad Dioscorum Alexandrinum post primam ante secundum Ephesenam.*

90 Verona LIX (57), fols. 170r–209v (docs. 47–49). See also CPG 9010, 9011, 9013. Note that these sessions are numbered differently in the Latin and Greek transmissions of the acts: Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon* (n. 15 above), 2:250, 258, 265.

91 Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon*, 2:250–309.

92 Verona LIX (57), fol. 174r: XLVIII *In̄ actio nona*, and fol. 178v: XLVIII *In̄ actio decima*.

honors Theodoret as *sanctus*, strongly suggests that these three Chalcedonian acts were part of the same *Sichardiana* source copied into Verona LIX (57). As we have already seen, the compiler of Verona LIX (57) frequently neglected to maintain the integrity of some of his documents as he separated them into different rubrics and sections of the manuscript. It should therefore not surprise us that the compiler could also have separated different documents *from the same source material* into different sections of the manuscript. Here, keeping the Chalcedonian acts next to the *Sichardiana* documents (fols. 12v–82r) would have disturbed the in-depth theological discussion preserved in the Christological segment of the manuscript (fols. 12r–129v). Instead, the compiler of Verona LIX (57) pushed the three Chalcedonian acts to the last segment of the manuscript dealing with ecclesiastical norms and regulations (fols. 129v–255v; the acts are in 170r–209v). Surrounded by texts concerning pastoral duties, canonical regulations, and ecclesiastical discipline, the Chalcedonian acts—with their detailed information on conciliar procedure—fit right in.

The rubrics of the *Sichardiana* documents help us identify one way in which the collection framed the dispute between Cyril and the Antiochenes in equalizing terms. As we will see in detail in the following pages, referring to both sides as *sancti* or *beati* would complement the careful distinction made in the *Sichardiana* documents between the different factions of the dispute. A close reading of the rubrics transmitted in the manuscript sources also suggests that the collection as it is currently printed in the *ACO* should be expanded and include the Chalcedonian acts transmitted in Verona LIX (57). While the contribution of Sichard's *Antidotum* to this analysis of rubrics is limited, the general correspondence of its rubrics to the ones surviving in the two manuscript sources nevertheless demonstrates that all three sources relied on a very similar earlier source, which has not survived independently.

The Tripartite Factionalism in Ephesus according to the *Sichardiana*

Despite attempts to present the dispute between Cyril and the Antiochenes as a dialogue between equals, evidence of factionalism is not glossed over in the *Sichardiana*. There was a major debate between Cyril

and the Antiochenes, and it receives ample treatment in the collection's documents. But as I will demonstrate in this section, the nuanced editorial manner in which the *Sichardiana* attempts to construct the debaters' positions embeds within it an elaborate apologetic argument: simultaneous with the attempt of the *Sichardiana*'s documents and their rubrics to bring Cyril and the Antiochenes closer together, the collection also attempts to position each of them in opposition to Nestorius. In the case of Cyril, this was fairly easy, since in most of his writings from the period we find explicit attacks against Nestorius. The *Sichardiana*'s attempt to position the Antiochenes in opposition to Nestorius was more challenging, however. Explicit voices against Nestorius would start rising in Antiochene circles only after the signing of the *Formula of Reunion* in 433.⁹³ Until then, the surviving evidence shows little hint of tension or rivalry between the Antiochenes and Nestorius.⁹⁴ But as I will demonstrate below, a few careful editorial choices in the *Sichardiana* seem to have overcome this difficulty.

The *Sichardiana*'s editorial construction of the opposition to Nestorius is exemplified in the second introductory letter of *Coll. Sich.* 4, which was originally Cyril's preface to his *Explanatio* (CPG 5223) and

93 The best-known case of Antiochene defection to Cyril's anti-Nestorian side is Rabbula of Edessa's. Scholars disagree over whether he joined Cyril before the ecumenical gathering in Ephesus in the summer of 431 or later in 432 (Schor, *Theodoret's People* [n. 3 above], 236, n. 88). We have further evidence of some defections from the Antiochene faction throughout the proceedings in Ephesus, although it would be difficult to see many of the defectors as integral members of the Antiochene network. See Schor's *Theodoret's People* for the most detailed study of the Antiochene network's robustness and coherence until 433. For further details on the defections throughout the proceedings, see R. Price, "Politics and Bishops' Lists at the First Council of Ephesus," *AnnHistCon* 44 (2012): 395–420.

94 Some scholars have argued that there was a personal breach between Nestorius and John of Antioch in the months leading to Ephesus and perhaps throughout the ecumenical gathering, too: see Bevan, *New Judas*, 142, 164, who generally follows Donald Fairbairn, "Allies or Merely Friends? John of Antioch and Nestorius," *JEH* 58.3 (2007): 383–99. In *Theodoret's People*, Schor outlines how the Antiochene network disintegrated, but this development started only in 433, following the peace between Cyril and John. We therefore need to be careful not to read the evidence from 431 anachronistically. I do not subscribe to the interpretation that there existed a conflict between John and Nestorius in Ephesus, but a detailed presentation of my arguments on the matter, chiefly based on *Coll. Sich.* 5 and 6, lies outside the scope of this paper.

is one of Cyril's most aggressive texts in the collection.⁹⁵ There, we find continuous attacks on Nestorius and on "certain people" who, according to Cyril, either did not understand his *Twelve Chapters* or attacked them merely because they were, in fact, the "guardians of Nestorius's wicked heresy."⁹⁶ Throughout his detailed apologetic responses in *Coll. Sich. 4*, Cyril nuances the distinction between Nestorius and his supposed "guardians" by stating that the sole intention behind the *Twelve Chapters* was to counter Nestorius's specific utterances, which Cyril even frequently cites in detail.⁹⁷ As Cyril clarifies in even stronger terms in the following documents of the *Sichardiana*, he never meant to offend or to attack his "Antiochene brothers."⁹⁸ Historically, Cyril's complete focus on Nestorius, which is repeated throughout his texts in the *Sichardiana*, was not easily registered by the Antiochenes. The clearest example of this misunderstanding is that in *Coll. Sich. 4*, as well as in all the *Sichardiana* documents that transmit texts or citations from the Antiochenes themselves, none of them ever tries to present his personal or their collective position as a defense of Nestorius or his teachings. In fact, outside of one single example in the concluding paragraph of the last document of the *Sichardiana* (*Coll. Sich. 18*), where Theodoret of Cyrillus spells out in a letter dated to 448 that he and John of Antioch had repeatedly condemned Nestorius and his teachings,⁹⁹ the name of Nestorius is never even brought up in any of the Antiochene texts in the *Sichardiana*.

The Antiochenes' distance from Nestorius is expressed most notably in the two documents immediately following *Coll. Sich. 4*. The first is *Coll. Sich. 5*, a synodal document from the Antiochene counter-council headed by John of Antioch in Ephesus in the summer of 431.¹⁰⁰ At no point throughout the proceedings in Ephesus did John's counter-council ever join Cyril's council; it is only the latter that eventually would become recognized as the First Ecumenical Council of Ephesus.¹⁰¹ In *Coll. Sich. 5*, we find a report of the Antiochenes' objections to Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* on procedural grounds (discussed in further detail in "The African Connection" below), and of the general difficulties they experienced throughout the summer in Ephesus. Appended to the synodal text is the next document of the collection, *Coll. Sich. 6*.¹⁰² The document is a detailed refutation of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* and complements the previous complaints against that work, but here on theological grounds. There is no mention of or even allusion to Nestorius in either document, despite their official affiliation with the Antiochene counter-council.

Through *Coll. Sich. 5* and 6 we are therefore presented with two themes that complement what we have seen in *Coll. Sich. 4*: first, further details on the core theological argument between the factions, and second, an additional expression of the peculiar factionalism underlying the dispute. Although it was Nestorius whose teachings had engendered it, as it is depicted in the *Sichardiana*, Nestorius consequently played a

95 While writing this apology, Cyril was placed under house arrest and his deposition from the Alexandrian see, decreed a few weeks back at the Antiochene counter-council, was confirmed by Emperor Theodosius II: Bevan, *New Judas*, 181–86, and more broadly 153–86 for the Antiochene counter-council.

96 *Coll. Sich. 4*, 251:13–15: *Offenduntur itaque meis sermonibus aliqui, aut non intelligentes vere horum quae sunt scripta virtutem aut effecti scelestae Nestorii haereseos protectores partitque impietatem et eadem quae ille sapientes.*

97 Several references throughout the work might demonstrate this point, but it is summarized quite succinctly in Cyril's response to Theodoret's refutation of the ninth chapter—*Coll. Sich. 4*, 273:36–274:1: *Dudum dixi quia Nestorii superfluitatibus seu blasphemis et multum neglegenter dictis virtus repugnat capitulorum*—which is followed by several citations from Nestorius himself to strengthen this point.

98 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to Acacius of Melitene* (ep. 40; CPG 5340), *Coll. Sich. 10*, 304:13. See also below, n. 115.

99 See below, n. 143.

100 John of Antioch et al., *The Synod of Orientals' Exposition of Faith* (CPG 6353), *Coll. Sich. 5*, 287:18–288:29. With the rubric *Synodi orientalium decreta atque eorum confessio qui cum Ioan. Antiocheno senserunt* (= Sichard, *Antidotum*, fol. 168r). In line with my previous observation that Sichard excised honorifics from the rubrics of documents in his edition, it is interesting to note that *Coll. Sich. 5* has also survived in a Greek conciliar collection and in another Latin collection. In the rubrics transmitted in both collections, John of Antioch's council retains its honorific *ἁγία* and *sancta*, respectively: the Greek is in *Collectio Vaticana* 96, ACO 1.13, 38:10, and the Latin (different translation from the one transmitted in the *Sichardiana*) in *Collectio Casinensis* 110, ACO 1.4, 61:32.

101 Bevan, *New Judas*, 162–81.

102 Anonymous, *Refutation of Cyril of Alexandria's Twelve Chapters* (CPG 6360), *Coll. Sich. 6*, 288:30–294:42. In Sichard's *Antidotum*—the only source of the *Sichardiana* in which it has survived—the text is appended to *Coll. Sich. 5* without interruption. Owing to the notable shift in content, as well as the survival of other independent versions of *Coll. Sich. 5* without the refutation in *Coll. Sich. 6*, Schwartz justifiably divided the seemingly single synodal document into two.

rather ambiguous role in the dispute. When we take this ambiguity into account, the emerging factionalism could be defined as tripartite: the Antiochenes on the one side, Cyril on the other, and Nestorius, whom the Antiochenes ignore and Cyril constantly attacks, somewhere in between.

The tripartite factionalism reflected through *Coll. Sich.* 4, 5, and 6 is particularly evident in the three opening documents of the collection:¹⁰³ *Coll. Sich.* 1 opens with one of the most important documents of the Nestorian Controversy, Cyril of Alexandria's *Third*

Letter to Nestorius, to which Cyril originally appended his *Twelve Chapters*.¹⁰⁴ The following document, *Coll. Sich.* 2, consists of twelve counter-chapters that are falsely attributed to Nestorius in the manuscript tradition.¹⁰⁵ They are followed by *Coll. Sich.* 3, which offers the suspicious creed that Charisios of Philadelphia had brought before Cyril's council in Ephesus,¹⁰⁶ and which we have previously examined in the context of Pope Vigilius's *First Constitutum* (see above, "The Three Chapters Controversy"). In the *Sichardiana*, the creed's rubric explicitly attributes it to Nestorius,¹⁰⁷ as Charisios had originally presented it, and as Cyril soon found out was incorrect.

It is not difficult to notice the intense focus in the introductory segment of the *Sichardiana* on Nestorius—first in Cyril's letter to Nestorius, which, beyond its appended anti-Nestorian *Twelve Chapters*, both includes a detailed refutation of Nestorius's heretical teachings (*Coll. Sich.* 1) and then repeats those teachings in Nestorius's supposed counter-chapters and creed (*Coll. Sich.* 2–3). The focus on Nestorius's role as the catalyst of the controversy may be glossed as a mere confirmation of what scholars have known for centuries about its history, though drawn here from two nongenuine Nestorian works (*Coll. Sich.* 2–3). But in light of the following documents of the *Sichardiana*, the placement of *Coll. Sich.* 1–3 as the introduction of the collection also presents an implicit argument: the complete silence in this introductory segment on the Antiochenes contributes to the tripartite factionalism that the *Sichardiana* carefully constructs in the following documents. After all, the more the *Sichardiana* centers on and magnifies the role of Nestorius in instigating

103 It is worth noting that the only source of the *Sichardiana* that transmits *Coll. Sich.* 1–3 is Sichard's *Antidotum*. Schwartz attempted to strengthen the three documents' ancient relation to the rest of the *Sichardiana* by pointing to another conciliar collection: the *Collectio Palatina*, a Latin collection from the time of the Theopaschite controversy of the early sixth century. The *Palatina* relies on some translations of originally Greek texts that were made by Dionysius Exiguus (fl. late fifth and early sixth century). The *Sichardiana* also transmits some of Dionysius's translations (*Coll. Sich.* 8–10, 17), as well as two introductory letters to these translations, which Dionysius dedicated to some of the main protagonists from the Theopaschite controversy (*Coll. Sich.* 7, 16). In addition, the *Palatina* includes a sequence of texts that is similar to the *Sichardiana* sequence of *Coll. Sich.* 2–4: it starts with a *disputatio* (*Coll. Pal.* 37) about Cyril's chapters and Nestorius's counter-chapters, which include the same version of the counter-chapters as does *Coll. Sich.* 2. The *disputatio* is followed by the acts of the sixth session of Cyril's council in Ephesus (*Coll. Pal.* 38), in which Charisios of Philadelphia presented the questionable "Nestorian" creed. There are no similarities in the translation between the version of the creed in *Coll. Pal.* 38 and in *Coll. Sich.* 3. Lastly, *Coll. Pal.* 39–40 include translations from the Greek original of Cyril's *Contra Orientales* (*Coll. Pal.* 39) and his *Contra Theodoretum* (*Coll. Pal.* 40). As previously mentioned (see above, n. 72), the version of the *Contra Theodoretum* in *Coll. Sich.* 4 contains some interpolations from the *Contra Orientales*. A recent reconstruction of the Theopaschite controversy's main developments is available in M. J. Pereira, "Reception, Interpretation and Doctrine in the Sixth Century: John Maxentius and the Scythian Monks" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2015), 194–207. The *Palatina* is edited in *ACO* 1.5.1. For Schwartz's discussion of the reverberations of the *Palatina* in the *Sichardiana*, see *ACO* 1.5.2, iii–iv.

Further evidence that the sequence of *Coll. Sich.* 1–3 is not an innovation by Sichard comes from a ninth-century manuscript originally from Fleury-sur-Loire but now housed in Berlin's Staatsbibliothek, MS Lat. 78 (Phill. 1671). At the end of the manuscript, we find the exact same versions of *Coll. Sich.* 1–3 presented in the same sequence as they occur in Sichard's *Antidotum*. Berlin Lat. 78 does not transmit any other *Sichardiana* documents, but the manuscript does include some peculiar florilegia whose earliest or only other witness is Verona LIX (57). On Berlin Lat. 78, see V. Rose, *Verzeichnis der lateinischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 1, *Die Meermann-Handschriften des Sir Thomas Phillipps* (Berlin, 1893), 142–49.

104 Cyril of Alexandria, *Third Letter to Nestorius* (CPG 5317), *Coll. Sich.* 1, 247 (incipit and explicit only); edited in *ACO* 1.5.1, 236:1–244:15. See also A. de Halleux, "Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au Concile d'Éphèse (430–433)," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 23.4 (1992): 425–58, and esp. 436–37 for evidence of the *Chapters'* early circulation throughout the Roman East.

105 Pseudo-Nestorius, *Twelve Counter-Chapters* (CPG 5761), *Coll. Sich.* 2, 247:8–249:7; see also E. Schwartz, "Die sogenannten Gegenanathematismen des Nestorius," *SBMünch* (1922): 27–28, and V. Grumel, ed., *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1, *Les actes des patriarches*, fasc. 1, *Les registres des 381 à 716*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1972), no. 61, 50.

106 Pseudo-Nestorius, *Exposition of Faith* (CPG 8721), *Coll. Sich.* 3, 249 (incipit only); edited in *ACO* 2.3.1, 213:5–215:21.

107 Sichard, *Antidotum* (n. 39 above), fol. 151v: *Exemplar sacrilegae expositionis Nestorii*.

the dispute, the more it shifts blame away from the Antiochenes and their actions both before Ephesus (their refutations of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*) and throughout (their conciliar activities against Cyril and his allies).¹⁰⁸ Consequently, the Antiochenes are moved closer to Cyril's side and farther from Nestorius's.

In the decades and centuries after Ephesus, highlighting the existence of a tripartite factionalism in the dispute over Nestorius's teaching would become significant in any argument against the condemnation of the Antiochenes (e.g., Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa) or their intellectual forefathers (e.g., Theodore of Mopsuestia). It is only through such a tripartite division of the controversy that one could coherently argue that the Antiochenes were, in fact, an intellectual and sociological faction distinct from that of Nestorius, and that they did not share his teachings. Reconstructing the tripartite division of the controversy, accordingly, could undermine attempts to condemn the Three Chapters as sympathizing with Nestorianism and opposed to Cyril of Alexandria.

The Theological Congruity between Cyril and the Antiochenes

As the following *Sichardiana* documents will show, highlighting the tripartite factionalism underlying the dispute was only one apologetic step taken in favor of the Antiochenes and, consequently, the Three Chapters. The next step was to show that the controversy in Ephesus between Cyril and the Antiochenes was not a controversy at all. Through this conceptual maneuver, the apologetic narrative of the *Sichardiana* shows us that the Antiochenes' teachings not only shared nothing with Nestorianism but were in line with Cyril's teachings all along.

The next thematic segment of the *Sichardiana* (*Coll. Sich.* 7–12) covers Cyril of Alexandria's personal testimony of the theological congruity between him and the Antiochenes. The segment opens with a brief introductory note (*Coll. Sich.* 7) written by Dionysius

Exiguus,¹⁰⁹ the sixth-century translator of the following three letters by Cyril: two letters to Succensus of Diocaesarea (*Coll. Sich.* 8 and 9),¹¹⁰ and another to Acacius of Melitene (*Coll. Sich.* 10).¹¹¹ The insertion of Dionysius's relatively late text (dated early sixth century) does not disrupt the thematic flow of the segment, since it contains a short clarification on the circumstances under which Cyril originally composed the following three letters, describing them as part of Cyril's battle against the spread of Nestorius's heretical thought.¹¹² While this comment may seem somewhat vague, it is significant since the following three letters to Succensus and Acacius contain some of the clearest dyophysite expressions in Cyril's extant writings.¹¹³ We are therefore presented with Cyril's fight against Nestorianism through his clarifications on the proper manner in which the two natures of Christ should be perceived and described.¹¹⁴ Especially significant are Cyril's details on the tripartite factionalism of the dispute, when he distinguishes between the orthodox dyophysite language of his fellow "Antiochene brothers" and the extreme division of Christ's two natures by

109 Dionysius Exiguus, *Letter to John and Leontius* (CPL 653a), *Coll. Sich.* 7, 294:43–295:27.

110 Cyril of Alexandria, *First Letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea* (ep. 45; CPG 5345), *Coll. Sich.* 8, 295:28–299:26, and Cyril of Alexandria, *Second Letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea* (ep. 46; CPG 5346), *Coll. Sich.* 9, 299:27–302:41.

111 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to Acacius of Melitene* (ep. 40; CPG 5340), *Coll. Sich.* 10, 303:1–307:3.

112 *Coll. Sich.* 7, 295:17–23.

113 E.g., Lionel Wickham sees certain phrases in the third paragraph of Cyril's *Second Letter to Succensus* (*Coll. Sich.* 9) as "the closest Cyril comes to the ἐν δύο φύσεσι of the Chalcedonian definition" (L. R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters* [Oxford, 1983], 89, n. 3). Further review of the dyophysite language in these three letters is offered in H. Van Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria* (Leiden, 2009), 524–29.

114 E.g., *Coll. Sich.* 8, 295:33–35 (cf. the Greek in ACO I.1.6, 151:13–15): *Quia vero tua perfectio sciscitatur utrum dicere in Christo duas naturas aliquando vel non dicere debeamus, ad hoc tibi respondere necessarium credidi*. The most explicit answer to this question is provided within a few paragraphs, in *Coll. Sich.* 8, 297:14–16 (cf. ACO I.1.6, 153:23–154:3): *Quantum ergo pertinet ad intellegendum solummodo et contemplandum oculis animae quomodo sit incarnatus unigenitus, duas naturas adunatas esse perspicimus, sed unum Christum filium et dominum dei verbum factum hominem incarnatumque profitemur*.

108 Their most notable actions were their condemnation of Cyril's teachings as heretical, their decree of excommunication against Cyril and his allies, and their verdict of Cyril's deposition from the Alexandrian see. The latter was even temporarily confirmed by Emperor Theodosius II. For further details on the Antiochene counter-council, see above, n. 95.

Nestorius, which consequently leads to the undermining of Christ's ontological unity.¹¹⁵

Cyril's attempt to defuse the factionalist tension while sharpening his attacks on Nestorius had a lot to do with the immediate context in which he wrote the three letters transmitted in *Coll. Sich.* 8–10. They belong to the period immediately following the peace with John of Antioch in 433, which culminated in the *Formula of Reunion*.¹¹⁶ In the three letters, Cyril responds to questions directed at him by his supporters who found it difficult to reconcile certain statements in the *Formula* with the principles they had fought for in Ephesus. The Christological doctrine articulated in the *Formula* contains not only very strong dyophysite language but also some notions that appear very similar to those Cyril had explicitly anathematized in his *Twelve Chapters*.¹¹⁷

The next two documents of the *Sichardiana* are *Coll. Sich.* 11 and 12; they include Paul of Emesa's and Cyril's addresses, whose rubrics we reviewed earlier (see above, "A Dialogue between Equals"). Both documents belong to the period immediately before the signing of the *Formula* and thus before Cyril's letters to Succensus and Acacius in *Coll. Sich.* 8–10.¹¹⁸ Despite the slight chronological divergence, the thematic flow is not interrupted, since the two addresses provide further examples of the apparent congruity between Cyril's Christology and the Antiochenes'. In *Coll. Sich.* 11, Paul of Emesa, whom John of Antioch delegated to reach a theological settlement with Cyril, presents in his address a short exposition of Antiochene Christology. In response, Cyril offers his own address in *Coll. Sich.* 12, where he repeats almost verbatim Paul's

Christological statements and explicitly subscribes to them. This is a notable deviation from extant Greek versions of Cyril's address, and it led Schwartz to suggest that the Latin version transmitted in the *Sichardiana* is probably a forgery.¹¹⁹ The antiquity of this forgery is confirmed by its transmission in the earliest witness of the *Sichardiana*, the late sixth-century Verona LIX (57), as well as its citation and discussion in the sixth-century *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* of Liberatus of Carthage.¹²⁰

Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Conclusion of the *Sichardiana*

Following the two addresses of Cyril of Alexandria and Paul of Emesa in *Coll. Sich.* 11 and 12, we find in *Coll. Sich.* 13 a letter by Cyril, dated to 419, whose contents do not easily fit the thematic concerns of the *Sichardiana*.¹²¹ Below, I will further discuss the letter and its significance in the collection, but for now it will suffice to note that the letter functions as a very convenient partition between the previous segment of the collection, concerning the Christological congruity between Cyril and the Antiochenes, and the following thematic segment, which deals with the dispute between Cyril and the Antiochenes over the famed Antiochene teacher Theodore of Mopsuestia. Here we will see further articulations of the tripartite factionalism of the dispute as they survive from a slightly later stage of the Nestorian Controversy, from the second half of the 430s. In this thematic segment of the collection, we will see how the *Sichardiana* includes some important testimonies of Cyril's support of the Antiochenes' campaign against the condemnation of Theodore, as well as additional evidence that helps diminish the historical significance of the dispute between Cyril and the Antiochenes.

115 See Cyril's detailed comparisons between Nestorius's teachings and the Antiochenes' in *Coll. Sich.* 10, 303:1–12, 304:5–18. The phrase "Antiochene brothers" appears in 304:13.

116 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to John of Antioch (About the Peace)* (ep. 39; CPG 5339), *Coll. Vat.* 127, *ACO* 1.1.4, 17:9–20. See also Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 222.

117 *Coll. Sich.* 9 (CPG 5346) is essentially Cyril's detailed response to Succensus's concerns that it is difficult to reconcile the strong dyophysite language of the *Formula of Reunion* with what would become one of the most well-known Miaphysite formulas, "one incarnated nature of the Word," which Cyril promoted since the beginning of the controversy. For early occurrences of the formula, see Van Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology*, 521–24. For further information on this episode between Cyril and his supporters, see Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria*, xxvi, and Bevan, *New Judas*, 228.

118 Bevan, *New Judas*, 217–19.

119 Schwartz, *Konzilstudien* (n. 38 above), 59–60.

120 Libératus de Carthage, *Abrégé de l'histoire* (n. 29 above), chap. 8, 168–78, esp. 172–74. See also Schwartz, *Konzilstudien*, 60–61, and U. Heil, "Liberatus von Karthago und die 'Drei Kapitel': Anmerkungen zum *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* 8–10," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 14.1 (2010): 40–44.

121 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to the Carthaginian Council* (ep. 85; CPG 5385), *Coll. Sich.* 13, 310 (incipit only); edited in C. Munier, *Concilia Africae, a. 345–a. 525*, CCSL 149 (Turnhout, 1974), 162–63. See also P. P. Joannou, ed., *Discipline générale antique (IV^e–IX^e s.)*, t. 1, vol. 2, *Les canons des synodes particuliers* (Grottaferrata, 1962), 422–24.

The four documents that deal with the dispute over the legacy of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Coll. Sich.* 14–17, belong to a complicated and fragmentarily documented controversy between Cyril and the Antiochenes that erupted a few years after the signing of the *Formula of Reunion* in 433. The sequence in which the documents are presented in the *Sichardiana* confuses the chronology of different episodes and thus offers very little help in elucidating the controversy's complicated developments. The opening document in the segment (*Coll. Sich.* 14) is a synodal letter of the Antiochenes from 438,¹²² in which they respond to attempts by Cyril and Proclus of Constantinople to promote the widespread condemnation of the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had passed away a decade earlier.¹²³ The Antiochenes' synodal letter is then followed by *Coll. Sich.* 15, whose title suggests that it is Cyril's response to the Antiochenes, yet it is actually Cyril's response to a different letter by John of Antioch that has not survived.¹²⁴ Following these two documents are Dionysius Exiguus's introductory letter to his translation of Proclus's *Tome to the Armenians* (*Coll. Sich.* 16) and the *Tome* itself (*Coll. Sich.* 17).¹²⁵ Proclus composed his *Tome* in 435 as an answer to reports about the circulation in Armenia of questionable teachings attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia. The *Tome* offers doctrinal clarifications, but without naming Theodore as the source of the teachings to which the *Tome* is responding.¹²⁶ A short summary of the affair, including an explanation of Theodore's role in it, is offered in Dionysius's introductory letter. This controversy is complex, but here it will suffice to describe the entire affair as it unfolds in the *Sichardiana* documents.

The Antiochenes' synodal letter to Cyril (*Coll. Sich.* 14), which opens the segment, touches upon two significant topics for the *Sichardiana*'s apologetic arc.

The first is reflected in the letter's explicit statement that John of Antioch and his fellow Antiochenes consider Proclus's *Tome* "a truly correct and pious work" and confirm that they accept its content in its entirety.¹²⁷ This statement early in the letter is significant, for the *Tome* was perceived by subsequent generations not only as an important Christological milestone that anticipated the Chalcedonian definition but also as a notable "mediating position" between the Christologies of Alexandria and Antioch.¹²⁸ The contents of both Proclus's *Tome* (*Coll. Sich.* 17) and the Antiochenes' synodal letter (*Coll. Sich.* 14) therefore complement the *Sichardiana*'s attempt to highlight the Christological congruity between Cyril and the Antiochenes.

The second significant topic in the Antiochenes' synodal letter has to do with their stance toward their Antiochene teacher, Theodore of Mopsuestia. This stance is clarified in the letter's title: "The letter of <John of> Antioch and the synod of the entire Oriens to saint Cyril, in favor of Theodore (*pro Theodoro*)."¹²⁹ Amid their various expressions of support toward Theodore and his intellectual heritage, we find the Antiochenes' complaints about being requested to condemn a series of extracts attributed to Theodore that appear in a version of Proclus's *Tome* different from the one they had previously received from Constantinople.¹³⁰ More interesting than the varied arguments presented by

122 John of Antioch et al., *Letter to Cyril (pro Theodoro)* (CPG 6312), *Coll. Sich.* 14, 311:1–314:6.

123 Bevan, *New Judas*, 271–79.

124 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to John of Antioch (pro Theodoro)* (ep. 91; CPG 5391), *Coll. Sich.* 15, 314:7–315:20. See also Schwartz, *Konzilstudien*, 32, n. 5.

125 Dionysius Exiguus, *Letter to Felicianus and Pastor* (CPL 653c), *Coll. Sich.* 16, 315 (rubric only); edited in ACO 4.2, 196:1–197:22; Proclus of Constantinople, *Tome to the Armenians* (CPG 5897), *Coll. Sich.* 17, 315 (rubric only); edited in ACO 4.2, 197:23–205:42.

126 Constas, *Proclus* (n. 6 above), 101–12. See CPG 5897, and Grumel, *Les regestes* (n. 105 above), no. 78, 63–64.

127 *Coll. Sich.* 14, 311:24–27: *Sanctissimo enim episcopo Proclo tomum recte re vera et pie habentem quem ad Armenios scripsit, nobis destinante et nostrum quaerente consensum, omnia facta sunt a nobis et in nullo minus fecimus.*

128 Constas, *Proclus*, 109: "[T]he *Tome* of Proclus adopts a 'mediating position' between the christologies of Antioch and Alexandria, a view held by virtually all commentators on this work." This remark is followed by a rich footnote with further references.

129 *Coll. Sich.* 14, 310:30–31: *Incipit eplā <Iohannis> Atiocheni et totius sinodi [sic] Oriētis ad sc̄m Cyrillū pro Theodoro.* The letter survives solely in Arsenal 341 (fols. 121v–123v), and its rubric, as noted in the transcription and translation, skipped the name of John for some reason. Since neither Arsenal 341 nor any other source I am familiar with ever refers to John just with the title "the Antiochene," there seems to be a mistake with the copy of the rubric here. It is even possible that the honorific *sanctus* or *beatus* was added here to John's name, as it was added in the rubric of the following document, *Coll. Sich.* 15, which also survives in Arsenal 341 (see below, n. 131, and above, n. 87).

130 *Coll. Sich.* 15, 311:30–34: *Aliud etiam malum est in istorum infestatione immanius: est eis et alter tomus, excerpta quaedam habens beati Theodori qui fuit Mopsuestiae episcopus, et quae ille in diversis libris dixisse videtur, volentes eis anathema inferre. Propter hoc petimus . . . dignare considerare malum opus hoc esse.*

the Antiochenes as to why they would never condemn Theodore is Cyril's amicable agreement with their concerns expressed in his supposed response (*Coll. Sich.* 15). Like the title of the Antiochenes' synodal letter, the title of Cyril's letter also foreshadows its content: "The letter of the blessed Cyril to the blessed John, the bishop of Antioch, and to the synod under him that gathered in favor of Theodore (*pro Theodoro*)."¹³¹ And as we have seen in the Antiochenes' letter, here, too, Cyril explains why he would never condemn Theodore: "For it is a serious thing," argues Cyril, "to scoff at the dead, even if they were laypeople, much more at those who departed from this life in the episcopacy."¹³² Moreover, Cyril recounts the episode from the Council of Ephesus when Charisios of Philadelphia had presented the questionable creed attributed to Nestorius that, as Cyril soon found out, should have been attributed to Theodore instead. Cyril highlights in the letter to John that while the creed was worthy of condemnation, the council did not dare to mention the name of Theodore nor "subject his name to an anathema . . . lest the Orientals who hold him in greater honor may, by chance, sever themselves from the unity of the body of the universal church and side with the hateful and condemned faction [i.e., Nestorius's]."¹³³ Cyril's letter, which includes an explicit argument against the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia and, therefore, an indirect argument against his condemnation by Justinian a century later, was subsequently quoted in several apologetic works in favor of the Three Chapters, as we have seen in Pope Vigilius's *First Constitutum*.¹³⁴ For identical reasons, the letter was deemed a forgery

by the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople convened under Justinian in 553.¹³⁵

Cyril's reason for not condemning Theodore's creed is worth lingering on. The tripartite factionalism that I have previously highlighted is clearly articulated here: Cyril and his council, on the one hand; the Antiochenes ("the Orientals") who hold Theodore in great honor, on the other hand; and between them "the hateful and condemned faction"—that is, Nestorius and his supposed faction in Ephesus.¹³⁶ But beyond outlining the tripartite factionalism, Cyril also attempts through his reasoning to bridge the factional divide between him and the Antiochenes: his reluctance to alienate the Antiochenes was the chief motivation for his refusal to condemn Theodore and the creed attributed to him. The historical inaccuracy of Cyril's claim should not be our immediate concern here.¹³⁷ What is more significant for our present purpose is the *Sichardiana*'s depiction of the affair: despite clear evidence of a dispute between Cyril and the Antiochenes, the dispute, as we learn from the *Sichardiana*, was limited in scope. As Cyril's own words testify, he was actively making sure that the Antiochenes would not be severed from the church owing to their perceived association with questionable teachings.

The anachronistic revisionism of the factionalist rivalry between Cyril and the Antiochenes is exemplified most clearly in the concluding letter of the collection,

131 *Coll. Sich.* 15, 314:7–8: *Epistula beati Cyrilli ad beatum Iohannem Antiochenum episcopum et ad synodum quae sub illo est congregata pro Theodoro*.

132 *Coll. Sich.* 15, 315:16–17: *grave est enim insultare defunctis, vel si laici fuerint, nedum illis qui in episcopatu hanc vitam deposuerunt*.

133 *Coll. Sich.* 15, 315:2–11, and in particular lines 7–10: . . . *dispensative mentionem viri non fecit* [i.e., Cyril's council] *neque eum nominatim anathemati subdidit neque alios, per dispensationem, sicuti est arbitrari, ne forte maiori opinioni illius viri, per quam eum adtendentes Orientales se ipsos dirumpant ab unitate corporis universalis ecclesiae et addant parti odibili et maledictae*.

134 Price, *Council of Constantinople* (n. 17 above), 1:325, n. 249, and above, n. 24.

135 Only a few documents from the Council of Constantinople of 553 have survived in their original Greek, and we have the complete conciliar acts only in their Latin translation (edited in *ACO* 4.1). In that translation, the above letter from Cyril, which was condemned in the council, is different from the translation transmitted in *Coll. Sich.* 15. As Richard Price has noted, "both translations struggle with what was clearly a tortuous piece of Greek (*not* a forgery), betraying Cyril's embarrassment at having to deplore a campaign against Theodore in which he himself had played an active part" (his italics; Price, *Council of Constantinople*, 1:325, n. 249; for the presentation of the letter at the council, see 1:324–27).

136 I added "supposed" because I am not familiar with any evidence that the Antiochenes were split into two factions in Ephesus; see above, n. 94.

137 Cyril condemned and excommunicated John of Antioch and those who participated in his counter-council on 17 July: *Gesta Ephesina, Actio IV et V* (CPG 8716), *Collectio Vaticana* 90, *ACO* 1.1.3, 24–26. Charisios presented his evidence against Nestorius in the 22 July session of Cyril's council (see above, n. 22). By then, Cyril had already severed the Antiochenes from, as he phrased it, "the unity of the body of the universal church" five days earlier, a split that lasted until the official peace between the two factions two years later in 433.

Coll. Sich. 18, which offers Theodoret of Cyrillus's letter to Dioscorus of Alexandria, Cyril's successor of the Alexandrian see (444–51).¹³⁸ The letter, dated to 448,¹³⁹ belongs to a renewed phase of the Nestorian Controversy, which would lead to Theodoret's deposition in the Second Council of Ephesus of 449 and culminate in the Council of Chalcedon of 451, where Dioscorus himself would be deposed and Theodoret reinstated. For our purposes, the key significance of the letter lies in how Theodoret depicts the factionalism between Cyril and the Antiochenes—or, perhaps more accurately, in how Theodoret attempts to argue that there actually never existed any factionalist tension. In the letter, Theodoret reports on his and John of Antioch's warm and long friendship with Cyril, during which they frequently exchanged many amicable letters on matters of theology.¹⁴⁰ Theodoret also includes some strong anti-Nestorian sentiments, such as his claim that he does not divide the Only Begotten into two sons (i.e., divine and human),¹⁴¹ that he accepts the epithet *Theotokos* (the core issue that had originally sparked the dispute between Cyril and Nestorius),¹⁴²

and that he had personally subscribed to several condemnations of Nestorius.¹⁴³

When we view Theodoret's letter as the conclusion of the affair to which we were introduced in *Coll. Sich.* 1, its outline becomes clear: John of Antioch was the leader of a moderate faction of Antiochenes, to which Theodoret of Cyrillus also belonged. Members of this faction explicitly and actively distanced themselves from Nestorius,¹⁴⁴ while simultaneously honoring Theodore of Mopsuestia as their spiritual forefather. Most importantly, following the temporary dispute between the two sides in Ephesus, the Antiochenes made peace with Cyril, reached an official Christological agreement with him, and thus confirmed their orthodoxy. In sum, not only were the Antiochenes not Nestorians but they were close colleagues of Cyril, the champion against the Nestorian heresy, whose achievements and status established him as a pillar of orthodoxy in many Christian traditions. When the dispute surrounding Nestorius's teaching is explained in such terms, how could anyone support Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters?

The African Connection

In the previous sections of this paper, I reviewed the *Sichardiana's* material remains and textual contents in order to highlight the collection's apologetic arguments regarding the Three Chapters and to confirm the late antique provenance of the collection's assembly. In the remaining sections of this paper, I wish to attempt to narrow down the collection's geographical origin. My argument will proceed in two steps: I will begin by highlighting some relevant cross-references that would provide the first hint at North Africa as the geographical origin of the collection's assembly. In the second step, I will review a prevailing emphasis in the collection on a peculiar tradition surrounding the Council of Nicaea of 325, which I believe will further strengthen the suggestion that the collection originated in Byzantine Africa.

138 Theodoret of Cyrillus, *Letter to Dioscorus of Alexandria* (ep. 83; CPG 6240), *Coll. Sich.* 18, 315:23–318:16.

139 Théodoret de Cyr, *Correspondance*, vol. 2, ed. T. Azéma, SC 98 (Paris, 1964), 204, n. 3.

140 *Coll. Sich.* 18, 317:37–43: *Quia vero beatae sanctaeque memoriae Quirillus saepe nobis scripsit, credo palam nosse etiam tuam beatitudinem. Et quando contra Iulianum conscriptiones factas in Antiochiam destinavit, similiter et quae in apompaeo scripta sunt, beatum Iohannem tunc Antiochinorum episcopum [rogavit] ut haec ostenderet splendentibus in Oriente doctoribus, cuius litteris oboediens beatus Iohannis direxit nobis libros, quos relegentes et admirati sumus et scripsimus beatae memoriae Quirillo et rescripsit iterum nobis et integritatem nostram adfectumque testatus est. Et servantur haec litterae apud nos.*

141 *Coll. Sich.* 18, 318:11–13: *Si quis non confitetur sanctam virginem dei genetricem aut purum hominem vocat dominum Iesum Christum aut in duos partitur unum unigenitum et primogenitum omnis creaturae, cadat ab spe quae in Christo est.* Interestingly, the emphasis here—that Theodoret does not divide the Only Begotten (*unigenitus*) into “two sons”—was not rendered into Latin as explicitly as it is stated in the Greek of the original letter. Cf. Théodoret de Cyr, *Correspondance*, 218: . . . ἢ εἰς δύο υἱοὺς μερῶς τὸν ἕνα Μονογενῆ.

142 *Coll. Sich.* 18, 317:5–9: *Propterea enim et dei genetricem vocamus sanctam virginem et hanc adpellationem respuentes alienos a pietate decernimus, similiter autem et eos qui in duas personas aut in duos filios aut duos dominos dividunt unum dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, adulteros nominamus et a Christo amabilem consortio removemus.*

143 *Coll. Sich.* 18, 318:1–2: *Quia vero nos dictatis tomis contra Nestorium a beatae memoriae Iohanne suscripsimus, testantur manus.*

144 The strongest expressions in the *Sichardiana* are from Theodoret's letter to Dioscorus (see above, nn. 141–43), John's letter to Cyril (*Coll. Sich.* 14, 311:17–22), and Cyril's letter to Acacius of Melitene (*Coll. Sich.* 10, 303:1–12, 304:5–18).

There are two explicit clues in the *Sichardiana* that point to its connection to the African reception of Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters. The first hint comes from the apparent relation between the *Sichardiana* and Liberatus of Carthage's *Breviarium*, one of the better-known investigative efforts into the history of Three Chapters that came out of Byzantine Africa.¹⁴⁵ As already mentioned, Liberatus cites the very same Latin version of Cyril of Alexandria's response to Paul of Emesa's address as the one found in the *Sichardiana*. The text in *Coll. Sich.* 12 establishes in Cyril's own (forged, most likely) words his subscription to the same Christological vision as that of his fellow Antiochenes. Relatedly, Liberatus's *Breviarium* also constructs the argument between Cyril and the Antiochenes as a temporary dispute between professional theologians in a manner similar to its construction in the *Sichardiana*.¹⁴⁶ Such a construction corresponds well with Leslie Dossey's recent observation that the Three Chapters Controversy was understood and played out in North Africa as "a broader defense of the right of *doctores*—clerical experts in divine law—to interpret texts for themselves."¹⁴⁷

Another hint at the *Sichardiana*'s African connection is *Coll. Sich.* 13, a document that I have described as a convenient partition between the segment of the collection dealing with the Christological congruity between Cyril and the Antiochenes (*Coll. Sich.* 7–12) and the segment dealing with Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Coll. Sich.* 14–17). *Coll. Sich.* 13 is a brief letter by Cyril to the bishop of Carthage, Aurelius, and the council that gathered under his leadership in 419. The letter does not correspond straightforwardly to any of the *Sichardiana*'s documents and contents. In the letter, Cyril responds to a request of Aurelius and the Carthaginian council for "the authentic copies from the Council of Nicaea," which, he notes, have been sent along with the letter.¹⁴⁸ No appended document related to Nicaea has survived in any of the

manuscript witnesses of this letter, including in the *Sichardiana*. Because of its seemingly unrelated content and its transmission solely in one manuscript source of the *Sichardiana*, Arsenal 341, Schwartz did not think that the letter belonged to the original collection. Consequently, it was not printed in the *ACO*.¹⁴⁹ In the following pages I will argue to the contrary. Cyril's letter to the Carthaginians belongs to another, more subtle theme that runs through the collection, which aims to highlight another layer of theological congruity between Cyril and the Antiochenes: their adherence not only to the Council of Nicaea of 325 but also to a very particular version of the Nicene Creed.

First, a clarification: the existence of strong emphases on the Nicene tradition in almost all the documents of the *Sichardiana* should be one of their least surprising features. After the end of the fourth century, Nicene Christianity became the only accepted (and legal) form of Christianity in the Roman East.¹⁵⁰ Moreover, while the Christological controversies of the following centuries have brought to light divergent doctrinal and theological traditions that would gradually fragment the eastern churches, it is safe to say that all the involved parties were essentially Nicenes. Nevertheless, in many of the surviving texts documenting them, the controversies are frequently depicted as campaigns of staunch defenders of the Nicene faith battling the supposedly anti-Nicene doctrines, and even alleged Arianism, of their opponents. In analyzing such depictions, it is certainly worth considering claims that particular Christological positions could undermine Trinitarian elements of Nicene theology. However, the frequent depictions of the Christological controversies in terms of the conflicts surrounding the Council of Nicaea also appear, in many cases, to be rhetorical tropes.¹⁵¹

149 See Schwartz's short remark in his preface to *ACO* 1.5.2, ii, and in Schwartz, *Konzilstudien* (n. 38 above), 62.

150 R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381* (Edinburgh, 1988), 820–23.

151 The attempt by Cyril's council in Ephesus to demonstrate that Nestorius's *Second Letter to Cyril* (CPG 5669) deviates from the Nicene Creed (although in this very letter Nestorius cites and confesses the creed) seems to me an appropriate example of this argument. See a relevant analysis of this stage of the proceedings in T. Graumann, "'Reading' the First Council of Ephesus (431)," in *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils, 400–700*, ed. R. Price and M. Whitby (Liverpool, 2009), 36–38. That this attempt was largely theatrical can be corroborated by properly understanding the methodology according to which Cyril's council examined and

145 See Philippe Blaudeau's introduction to Libératus de Carthage, *Abrégé de l'histoire* (n. 29 above), 7–90.

146 Heil, "Liberatus von Karthago" (n. 120 above), 48.

147 L. Dossey, "Exegesis and Dissent in Byzantine North Africa," in *North Africa under Byzantium and Early Islam*, ed. S. T. Stevens and J. P. Conant (Cambridge, MA, 2016), 252.

148 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to the Carthaginian Council* (ep. 85; CPG 5385), in Munier, *Concilia Africae* (n. 121 above), 162:14–25.

If, as suggested above, we should seriously consider the possibility that the *Sichardiana* originated in sixth-century Byzantine Africa, then the Nicene theme of the collection suddenly becomes much more significant than a trope. For in North Africa, especially between the fifth and early sixth centuries, expressing one's adherence to the Council of Nicaea was not a mere rhetorical ploy but a very real and relevant struggle of the local Christian community. Since the Vandal conquest of the region in the 430s, a notable line of demarcation between the new conquerors and the local Roman population was drawn in terms of religious confession. The prevailing Nicene confession among African Christians stood at odds with the Vandals' strand of Arianism, a non-Nicene confession that emphasizes the existence of a hierarchy (instead of the Nicene consubstantiality) between the persons of the Trinity. The Vandals appear to have sought to eliminate this local confessional demarcation by heavily promoting their own version of Christianity.¹⁵² At times, these attempts became full-blown waves of persecution, during which members of the local Nicene clergy were exiled and subjected to confiscation of property and even to violence.¹⁵³

Following the reconquest of North Africa by the Byzantine forces of Justinian, it must have been a relief for the local Christian community to find itself once again under a Nicene ruler. But as it soon found out, this relief was short-lived. Within a decade of the Byzantine reconquest, members of the African clergy were faced with Justinian's demand to condemn the teachings of Theodore, Theodore, and Ibas, who were not only long dead but also, as it was discovered after some investigation, staunch Nicenes. In Africa, in contrast to other locales around the Mediterranean, the persecution and condemnation of Nicene Christians

was not a distant memory. Some of the very same clerics who were asked to condemn the Three Chapters had actually lived through and personally experienced the anti-Nicene persecutions of the Vandals.¹⁵⁴ The possible undermining of the Nicene faith was thus an added concern of the Africans who resisted Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters.¹⁵⁵

Establishing that the Antiochenes were positively Nicenes is thus fully consistent with the African argument against the condemnation of the Three Chapters. And one of the clearest expressions of the Antiochenes' Nicene adherence is their synodal document transmitted in *Coll. Sich.* 5, a document that is also known as the Antiochenes' *Confessio* (CPG 6353).¹⁵⁶ The *Confessio*, which was written sometime in August 431 (more than two months after the ecumenical gathering in Ephesus had begun), includes a summary of the controversy from the Antiochenes' perspective: following the arrival of all the bishops to Ephesus in order to solve the recent unspecified "ecclesiastical issues" (i.e., the dispute between Nestorius, whom they never mention, and Cyril), the disturbances raised by Cyril greatly delayed any progress to reach a settlement. Most worrisome, the Antiochenes report, were Cyril's attempts to introduce innovations into the official teachings of the church with his "heretical *Chapters*," to which he requested all present bishops to subscribe.¹⁵⁷ The Antiochenes, in response, began a campaign to persuade the bishops

judged Nestorius, on which see P. T. R. Gray, "The Select Fathers: Canonizing the Patristic Past," *StP* 23 (1989): 24–25. The legal significance of associating one's opponents with illegal heresies should also be considered: A. Cameron, "Enforcing Orthodoxy in Byzantium," in *Discipline and Diversity*, ed. K. Cooper and J. Gregory, *Studies in Church History* 43 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2007), 8–9.

152 On the Vandals' Arianizing policies, including an important emphasis on the difficulties of accurately evaluating them from the surviving evidence, see Conant, *Staying Roman* (n. 27 above), 159–95. See also Y. Modéran, "Une guerre de religion: Les deux Églises d'Afrique à l'époque vandale," *AntTard* 11 (2003): 21–44.

153 Mistreatment spiked especially during the late fifth-century persecution described in Victor of Vita's *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae*. See the analysis in Conant, *Staying Roman*, 180–86.

154 For prosopographical details, see Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres" (n. 28 above), 50–54.

155 Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," 53.

156 So the document refers to itself in *Coll. Sich.* 5, 288:4—Ὁμολογία, in the Greek original: *Collectio Vaticana* 96, *ACO* 1.1.3, 38:27. We find an additional reference to this document as a *confessio*/ὁμολογία in another synodal letter by the Antiochenes: John of Antioch et al., *Letter to Theodosius and Valentinian* (CPG 6328), *Collectio Atheniensis* 48, *ACO* 1.1.7, 69:42 (Greek); *Collectio Casinensis* 105, *ACO* 1.4, 56:18 (Latin).

157 In the surviving evidence from Cyril's faction in Ephesus, there is no indication that Cyril had explicitly made such a request. The accusation is repeated in another synodal letter of the Antiochenes: John of Antioch et al., *Letter to the People of Constantinople* (CPG 6343), *Collectio Vaticana* 157, *ACO* 1.1.5, 129:11–14 (trans. in Price and Graumann, *Council of Ephesus* [n. 1 above], 334–35). The Antiochenes may be referring here to the fact that Cyril's *Third Letter to Nestorius* and its appended *Twelve Chapters* were joined with official conciliar documents, to which the present bishops in Ephesus might have been asked to subscribe. The transmission history of Cyril's *Third Letter* and its appended *Chapters* in conciliar contexts, from Ephesus 431 onward,

who had subscribed to Cyril's *Chapters* that they all should be content with the Nicene faith alone and not be compelled to add anything to it.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, as a direct response to Cyril's measures to confirm his *Chapters* "by decree and subscriptions of bishops,"¹⁵⁹ the Antiochenes were compelled to produce this *Confessio* and to confirm it with their own subscriptions.¹⁶⁰ According to the Antiochenes, the *Confessio* is "sufficient to teach the soundness of piety, to show the path of truth, and to confute the error of heretical perverseness."¹⁶¹ The *Confessio* then cites the Nicene Creed in full. Following the familiar phrasing of the creed, we are presented with this brief note:

This is the faith that the fathers have set forth, first against the blasphemous Arius who said that the Son of God was created, and then against all the heresies of Sabellius, Photinus, Paul of Samosata, Mani, Valentinus, Marcion, and against all the heresies that rose against the Catholic Church and which the 318 bishops who gathered in Nicaea condemned.¹⁶²

is still an open question in scholarship: Graumann, "'Reading' the First Council of Ephesus," 36–41.

158 *Coll. Sich.* 5, 287:30–34: *temptavimus quidem eos episcopos qui consenserant Aegypto et capitulis haereticis ab eo expositis subscripserant, suadere adimere quidem illa quae orthodoxae fidei evidenter adferunt corruptelam, contentos vero esse expositione quae apud Nicaeam fuerat dudum facta.*

159 *Coll. Sich.* 5, 288:28.

160 Individual subscriptions are not included in any of the extant versions of this document. Evidence that there were subscriptions is presented in the *Confessio* itself (see below, n. 161) and in another document appended to the *Confessio* in the Greek manuscript tradition: *Mandatum Orientalium episcopis Constantinopolim directis* (CPG 8742), *Collectio Vaticana* 96, *ACO* 1.1.3, 38:4–5.

161 *Coll. Sich.* 5, 288:2–6: *compulsi sumus nos, qui fidei sanae patrum permanemus et nihil ei extraneum inferre concedimus, scripturaliter eam exponere et propriis subscriptionibus nostram confessionem firmare. Sufficit enim paucorum horum sermonum expositio et pietatis docere cautelam et veritatis ostendere semitam et haereticae arguere pravitate errorem.*

162 *Coll. Sich.* 5, 288:18–22: *Haec est fides quam exposuerunt patres primum adversus Arium blasphemantem et dicentem creaturam filium dei et adversus omnes haereses Sabellii et Photini et Pauli Samosatani et Manichaei et Valentini et Marcionis et adversus omnes haereses quae insurrexerunt adversus catholicam ecclesiam, quas condemnauerunt CCCXVIII episcopi qui apud Nicaeam convenerunt.*

Immediately thereafter, the Antiochenes add that they "confess this exposition of faith to be perpetual."¹⁶³ Their remark strongly suggests that the Antiochenes perceived this note to be an inherent part of the Nicene Creed to which they just confessed. As scholars since the late nineteenth century have observed, very few versions of the Nicene Creed are accompanied by the above note; yet every manuscript that preserves this note with the Nicene Creed also preserves among its folios some of the earliest documentary evidence surrounding the Council of Nicaea.¹⁶⁴ The note is sometimes referred to in scholarship as the "historical note" or "Antiochene supplement" of the Nicene Creed; in the Latin manuscript tradition, it serves as one criterion among many others in reconstructing the earliest recensions of canonical codifications in the Latin West,¹⁶⁵ a point on which I will expand below. The note's occurrence in the Greek tradition is much rarer, however, and can thus serve as an easier starting point in our attempt to understand its significance in the *Sichardiana*.

The note survives in Greek solely in two late antique texts: in the Greek original of the Orientals' *Confessio*,¹⁶⁶ and in a late fifth-century *Ecclesiastical History* by an anonymous cleric from Cyzicus—a work that until recently has been wrongly attributed to a certain Gelasius of Cyzicus.¹⁶⁷ Despite its title, the Cyzicenus's work deviates from the genre of church history, since it focuses almost exclusively on one historical event: the synodal gathering in Nicaea in 325, which would become known as the first ecumenical church council.¹⁶⁸ One of the most debatable aspects of this

163 *Coll. Sich.* 5, 288:22: *Huic expositioni fidei permanere confitemur nos.* Cf. the phrasing in the Greek original of the document in *ACO* 1.1.3, 39:12.

164 The note is edited in C. H. Turner, ed., *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima: Canonum et conciliorum graecorum interpretationes latinae*, 1.1.2 (Oxford, 1904), 110–11.

165 Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen* (n. 33 above), 39–40; E. Honigmann, "La liste originale des pères de Nicée: À propos de l'Évêché de 'Sodoma' en Arabie," *Byzantion* 14.1 (1939): 72–74; and Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen" (n. 32 above), 14–15.

166 John of Antioch et al., *Expositio fidei synodi Orientalium* (CPG 6353), *Collectio Vaticana* 96, *ACO* 1.1.3, 39:12–2.

167 G. C. Hansen, ed., *Anonyme Kirchengeschichte (Gelasius Cyzicenus, CPG 6304)*, 2.27:7–9 (Berlin, 2002), 84:20–27.

168 G. Marasco, "The Church Historians (II): Philostorgius and Gelasius of Cyzicus," in *Greek & Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, ed. Marasco (Leiden, 2003), 287.

work is the question of its sources. In its introduction, the anonymous author states that he bases his history on an ancient book containing documentation of the entire proceedings of the Council of Nicaea.¹⁶⁹ As scholars have demonstrated, however, not only do the supposedly unique Nicene sources brought forth in the work appear to be inauthentic,¹⁷⁰ but most of the text generally follows the accounts of other well-known fourth- and fifth-century historians who wrote about the Council of Nicaea.¹⁷¹ Moreover, as scholars' interest in the literary practice of composing and transmitting conciliar acts has grown, it has been argued that in fact the Council of Nicaea might have never produced official records, at least not in any form similar to that in which church councils have produced them since the early fifth century.¹⁷²

While the Cyzicenus's work seems to teach us nothing new about the early fourth-century debates surrounding Nicaea, this might not be the case with regard to the later reception of Nicene documentation, especially in the fifth and sixth centuries. Consider the following evidence from the Cyzicenus's history combined with the *Collectio Sichardiana*: in the general context of establishing the Nicene allegiance of the Antiochenes in the *Sichardiana*, the Antiochenes' *Confessio* is included (*Coll. Sich.* 5), wherein we find the Nicene Creed and its rare endnote. The only other Greek version of the creed with its rare note is found in the Cyzicenus's late fifth-century *Ecclesiastical History*; and, as mentioned above, the *History* purports to be based on what the author believed to be the official records of Nicaea. Relatedly, in *Coll. Sich.* 13 we find a letter by Cyril addressed to a Carthaginian council, in which it is mentioned that "the most genuine copies" of the Council of Nicaea are sent along with this letter, as

requested;¹⁷³ the appended "genuine copies" in Cyril's letter have not survived. It certainly seems, therefore, that since the early fifth century, a document believed to contain the authentic records of the Council of Nicaea was circulating around the Mediterranean.

In light of the evidence for this elusive Nicene document, I would like to offer the following hypothesis in an attempt to highlight its relevance to the apologetic project underlying the *Sichardiana*. In the sixth century, the African editor of the *Sichardiana* had access to a document believed to preserve the records of the Nicene proceedings. This document was believed to have been the same as the one Cyril had sent to the Carthaginians in 419, as reported in his letter preserved in *Coll. Sich.* 13. This Nicene document also seems to have been available to the Antiochenes who gathered in 431 in Ephesus, as demonstrated by their *Confessio* in *Coll. Sich.* 5, which includes the Nicene Creed followed by its rare endnote.¹⁷⁴ Thus, by including the *Confessio* and Cyril's letter in the collection, the editor of *Sichardiana* could have established not only the strong Nicene adherence of the Antiochenes but also their adherence to the very same creed that Cyril had sent to Carthage a century earlier.

One way to test this hypothesis would be to examine the Nicene records that Cyril appended to his letter to Carthage. Unfortunately, only Cyril's actual letter, without those records, has survived in the manuscript tradition, though there have been several contested attempts to reconstruct them.¹⁷⁵ But since my main

169 Hansen, *Anonyme Kirchengeschichte*, I.pro.2, I:11–15: πάντα τὰ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐναρέτῳ καὶ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ λεχθέντα τε καὶ πραχθέντα καὶ διατυπωθέντα πάλαι τε καὶ πρόπαλαι ἀναγνοῦς ἔτι ἐν τῇ πατρώᾳ οἰκίᾳ διάγων, εὐρηκὼς αὐτὰ ἐν βιβλῳ ἀρχαιοτάτῃ ἐγγεγραμμένα ἐν μεμβράναις ἅπαντα ἀπαρλείπτως ἐχούσαις.

170 Hansen, *Anonyme Kirchengeschichte*, xli–lv; Marasco, "The Church Historians (II)," 285–86; and C. T. H. R. Erhardt, "Constantinian Documents in Gelasius of Cyzicus, *Ecclesiastical History*," *JbAC* 23 (1980): 48–57.

171 Marasco, "The Church Historians (II)," 285.

172 E. Chrysos, "The Synodal Acts as Literary Products," in *L'icône dans la théologie et l'art*, Études théologiques 9 (Chambésy, 1990), 89.

173 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letter to the Carthaginian Council* (ep. 85; CPG 5385), in Munier, *Concilia Africae* (n. 121 above), 162:16–20: quibus a nobis speratis, ut de scrinio nostrae ecclesiae verissima exemplaria ex authentico synodo apud Nicaenam civitatem metropolim Bythiniae a sanctis patribus constituta atque firmata, sub nostrae fidei professione vestrae dilectioni porrigamus. The surviving Greek version of the letter seems to be a translation from Latin; see below, n. 203. As mentioned earlier, Schwartz did not edit this letter in the *ACO*.

174 The note is also alluded to in John of Antioch, *Ep. ad Proclum episc. Constantinopolis* (CPG 6317), *Collectio Casinensis* 287, *ACO* I.4, 209:14–20.

175 The attempts at reconstruction centered on materials transmitted in Verona LX (58). For a detailed review of the relevant scholarship, see A. Camplani, "Lettere Episcopali, Storiografia Patriarcale e Letteratura Canonica: A Proposito del *Codex veronensis* LX (58)," *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 3.1 (2006): 117–64, esp. 146–56. The most serious rebuttal to these reconstructions is offered in L. L. Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX* (Toronto, 2004), 56–116, esp. 64–82.

interest in this paper is to investigate the *Sichardiana* itself, its sources, and the sixth-century North African context in which it was assembled, I can redefine the test case of my hypothesis and slightly narrow it down in scope: rather than trying to reconstruct and track down the early fifth-century Nicene records that Cyril had sent to Carthage, what I am actually interested in establishing is what kind of Nicene records could have been available to the sixth-century editor of the *Sichardiana*, records that could have been easily identified with what Cyril had sent to Carthage more than a century before. The answer to this question, I would argue, is found in the canonical collection surviving in the last folios of Verona LIX (57).

The Beginning of Canonical Codification in North Africa and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57)

In order to appreciate the historical significance of the canonical collection transmitted in Verona LIX (57), as well as its relevance to my argument for the North African provenance of the *Sichardiana*, I will review in this section a series of events that took place more than a decade before the Council of Ephesus of 431, and mainly involved participants from Italy and North Africa. This shift to the western Mediterranean will be a significant detour from matters pertaining to the Christological controversies that have concerned us throughout the bulk of this paper. In attempt to ease the somewhat disorienting effect of the following detour, I offer in the last paragraph of this section a summary of its main contributions to my overall argument. The reader is welcome to skip straight to that paragraph, or to continue along as we delve into the earliest documented history of the arrival and codification of Greek canonical legislation in the Latin West.

On 25 May 419, two hundred and seventeen African bishops gathered in Carthage to discuss a peculiar dispute originating in Sicca Veneria (in present-day northwestern Tunisia). The year before, the bishop of Sicca, Urban, had deposed and excommunicated a local priest by the name of Apiarius. Apiarius, in response, sought redress from none other than Pope Zosimus (417–418). The bishop of Rome seems to have predicted that his involvement in a relatively minor and faraway dispute might be contested locally. In his official rejoinder, accordingly, he added some arguments to justify

his involvement, such as the right of clerics to appeal to Rome as confirmed in two canons issued at the Council of Nicaea from the previous century. But the African audience who received Zosimus's reply was baffled: nowhere in the Nicene records held in their archives could they find the two canons cited by Zosimus. As a result, the Carthaginian council of 419 was convoked. Its decisions reflect the seriousness with which the Africans took the unexpected turn of Apiarius's case: following a confession of his offenses, the council reinstated Apiarius (although he was not allowed to continue his office in Sicca) and commenced an investigation into the surviving records of the Council of Nicaea. The investigation's first order of business was to issue official requests to the churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople for copies of their Nicene records.¹⁷⁶ The response of Alexandria to this request, but without any appended Nicene records, has survived in Cyril of Alexandria's letter to the Carthaginian council of 419 (*CPG* 5385), the same letter that is also transmitted in the *Sichardiana* (*Coll. Sich.* 13).

By late 424, the affair of Apiarius resurfaces in our sources, when, again, he appeared before a Carthaginian council. This time his offenses had occurred in the coastal town of Tabraca, and following a local judgment of excommunication against him, Apiarius, again, had turned to Rome. In an almost comical repetition of the affair from 419, the bishop of Rome, now Pope Celestine (422–432), restored Apiarius into communion and sent envoys to Africa to justify this decision while relying—again—on Nicene canons that the Africans could not find in their archives. This time, however, the Africans were prepared with the preliminary results of their investigation from 419, which included the Nicene records they had received from the Greek East. In their letter to Pope Celestine, the Africans emphasize that they had forwarded to Rome those Nicene records in 419, and the records show that

176 A thorough review of this incident is available in B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, vol. 3, A.D. 408–461 (Oxford, 1922), 162–71. The reconstruction of the affair is based on the so-called Apiarian Codex, edited in Munier, *Concilia Africae*, 79–172. See also F. L. Cross, "History and Fiction in the African Councils," *JTS*, n.s., 12.2 (1961): 227–47, esp. 240–44, and J. Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église en Occident du II^e au VII^e siècle* (Paris, 1985), 81–82.

the canons already cited by Rome on two occasions are not part of the Nicene records preserved elsewhere.¹⁷⁷

With the evidence surrounding the Carthaginian council of 424–25, the case of Apiarius concludes in our surviving sources. Even though we have no clear indications of the future of either Apiarius or the investigation into the divergent Nicene records that had arrived in Africa and Rome after 419, later generations of scholars have continued to study this episode and to emphasize its significance. For Protestant and Catholic authors since the Reformation, Apiarius's case has symbolized a challenging and, at times, an embarrassing episode in the history of the papacy.¹⁷⁸ For scholars of canon law, the case sheds light on the earliest recorded efforts to investigate and to codify canonical legislation in the Latin West. It is exactly in the manuscript traditions of the documentation surrounding Apiarius's case where we find evidence of some of the earliest Latin canonical collections, which include not only canons originally issued in Western church councils but also translated canons that correspond to one of the earliest known canonical collections in the Greek East. This ancient Greek canonical collection seems to have reached the West and been translated into Latin as a result of the Africans' request for the Nicene records preserved in the archives of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople.

The oldest surviving Latin canonical collection is known to scholars by a variety of names; the better-known ones include the ancient *Isidoriana* (owing to its mistaken authorial attribution to Isidore of Seville),¹⁷⁹ the Freising-Würzburg version (after the two chief manuscripts that transmit it),¹⁸⁰ and, most recently,

the *Corpus Canonum Africano-Romanum* (a name that reflects the debates in scholarship about the collection's origin, either Roman or African). The collection seems to have emerged as a response to Apiarius's case and is thus dated to ca. 419.¹⁸¹ Throughout the twentieth century, scholars proposed different interpretations of the collection's position regarding the Apiarius case, viewing the collection as supporting either Rome, and its prerogatives to adjudicate Apiarius's case, or the Africans who proved that Rome was relying on canons that cannot be found in any preserved records of the Council of Nicaea. It was in 1992 when Hubert Mordek suggested that, in fact, the collection exhibits both pro-Roman and pro-African elements, and it thus deserves to be recognized as a hybrid African-Roman work.¹⁸²

Next to its documentation of Apiarius's case,¹⁸³ the *Corpus Canonum Africano-Romanum* (henceforth *CCAR*) includes a translated version of one of the oldest canonical collections from the Greek East—a collection usually known in scholarship as the Antiochene Corpus,¹⁸⁴ which seems to have been included in the replies of the eastern churches to the Africans' request for their Nicene records. The Antiochene Corpus is notable for the particular councils it includes, their semichronological order of presentation, and the enumeration system of their canons: while each council is presented with its own rubric, the councils' canons are numbered sequentially from *i* to *clx*, and they include,

the collection is sometimes also known as the Maassen consensus or the like. For further bibliography, see L. Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400–1140): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature* (Washington, DC, 1999), 2–3 (on the *Collectio Frisingensis prima*), 4–5 (on the *Collectio Wirceburgensis*).

181 Turner, "Chapters in the History of Latin MSS of Canons, V," 337–40, and H. Mordek, "Karthago oder Rom? Zu den Anfängen der kirchlichen Rechtsquellen im Abendland," in *Studia in honorem eminentissimi Cardinalis Alphonsi. M. Stickler*, ed. R. J. Castillo Lara (Rome, 1992), 362–64. See also H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica, A.D. 343: A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law* (Oxford, 1958), 153–54, and the bibliography in Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, 1–2.

182 Mordek, "Karthago oder Rom?," 359–74.

183 Cross, "History and Fiction," 240–44.

184 Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen," 27–43; Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église*, 75–76; D. Wagschal, *Law and Legality in the Greek East: The Byzantine Canonical Tradition*, 381–883 (Oxford, 2015), 32–34; and A. Mardirossian, *La collection canonique d'Antioche: Droit et hérésie à travers le premier recueil de législation ecclésiastique (IV^e siècle)* (Paris, 2010).

177 Munier, *Concilia Africae*, 166–72, esp. 169–72, for the Carthaginian council's (of 424–25) letter to Celestine. See also *CPL* 1765g, and Kidd, *A History of the Church*, 169–71. In the letter, the Carthaginians mention only the replies of Constantinople and Alexandria. It seems that Antioch's reply, if it had ever been sent, never reached Carthage.

178 See the comments and references in Kidd, *A History of the Church*, 162–71. See also C. H. Turner, "Chapters in the History of Latin MSS of Canons, V. The Version called Prisca: (a) the Justel MS (J) now Bodl. e Mus. 100–102, and the *editio princeps* (Paris, 1661)," *JTS* 30.120 (1929): 342–46.

179 Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen* (n. 33 above), 12–21, 71–87; Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen" (n. 32 above), 11–27; and Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église*, 76–78.

180 Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen," 11–12, n. 2. This text was first collated in Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 924–38, and thus

in the following order, the canons issued at the councils of Nicaea (325), Ancyra (314), Neocaesarea (314?), Gangra (340?), Antioch (328?), Laodicea (343?), and Constantinople (381).¹⁸⁵

In the *CCAR*, the translated version of the Antiochene Corpus preserves the above characteristics but with a unique and very notable twist: following the twenty Nicene canons that open the collection, we find a new rubric introducing us to a new set of forty canons, which are numbered independently, without disturbing the enumeration of canons that follow (i.e., from *xxi* to *clx*). These forty canons, the rubric states, come from “the Council of Nicaea of twenty bishops, which are not held in Greek, but are found in Latin in the following manner.”¹⁸⁶ Below the rubric, a short preface attempts to clarify that the following canons are those that “were titled by the twenty bishops at Serdica.”¹⁸⁷ These are, in fact, the forty canons from the (Western) Council of Serdica of 343,¹⁸⁸ among which we find the two supposedly Nicene canons that Rome cited twice in the Apiarius controversy.¹⁸⁹ As would become clearer in later Latin canonical collections and through highly nuanced scholarly work on early canon law, the Nicene and Serdican canons were preserved as a continuous series in the papacy’s archive. As a result, the canons of Serdica were mistakenly understood in Rome, at least until the late fifth century, to have been issued at the Council of Nicaea.¹⁹⁰

185 It should be noted that the canons of the Council of Constantinople (381) are enumerated independently, probably indicating their later addition to the Antiochene Corpus. For the uncertain dates of some of those councils, see Mardirossian, *La collection canonique d’Antioche*, 73–134.

186 Turner, *Ecclesiae* (n. 164 above), 1.2.3, 540: *Incipit concilium Nichenum [sic] XX episcoporum [regulae] quae in graeco non habentur sed in latio inveniuntur ita*; see 535 for further details on the manuscripts where the above note is found. See also Schwartz, “Kanonessammlungen,” 69, n. 1.

187 Turner, *Ecclesiae*, 1.2.3, 540:16–23: *Praeterea sunt aliae quadraginta regulae quae per Osium episcopum Cordobensium currunt, quae titulantur tamquam viginti episcoporum apud Serdicam: quae tamen non apud graecos sed apud latinos magis inveniuntur*.

188 Hess, *Canons of the Council of Sardica*, 1–67 = H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica* (Oxford, 2002), 93–140.

189 Namely, the seventh and seventeenth canons of Serdica, on which see Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law*, 190–200.

190 See Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law*, 124–10, as well as almost all the scholarship cited in this section of the paper.

In early Latin manuscripts that transmit canonical collections, we sometimes find a different family of recensions of the Antiochene Corpus. Though similar to the Antiochene Corpus as it occurs in the *CCAR*, these recensions are nevertheless distinct from it and represent slightly different translations of the original Greek material. As we will see below, they also sometimes include material from the Antiochene Corpus that has not survived in the *CCAR*. This family of recensions is known as the vulgate *Isidoriana* (as opposed to the ancient *Isidoriana* of the *CCAR*).¹⁹¹ Most importantly for our purposes, beyond their transmission of the Antiochene Corpus, the vulgate *Isidoriana* recensions continued to treat the Nicene and Serdican canons as a continuous series, despite the emergence of new canonical collections from the middle of the fifth century that both properly identified the Serdican canons and separated them from the Nicene canons under different rubrics.¹⁹²

In the last folios of Verona LIX (57) we find one of the earliest preserved witnesses of the Antiochene Corpus of the vulgate *Isidoriana* recension.¹⁹³ It contains the same sequence of councils and their canons as we find in the ancient *Isidoriana* of the *CCAR*,¹⁹⁴ including the Nicene and Serdican canons in a continuous series. Here, however, the series is not interpreted by any rubric or an explanatory preface as in the *CCAR*; the canons of Nicaea and Serdica are simply presented one after the other, without interruption, and under

191 Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 13–16 (concerning the vulgate recensions of Nicaea), 83–87 (concerning other councils from the Antiochene Corpus, with sporadic references to their vulgate recensions). See also Field, *On the Communion*, 83, n. 106.

192 Most notably, the *Prisca* and the early sixth-century *Dionysiana* (Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 65–130, and Schwartz, “Kanonessammlungen”).

193 Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 13–16, 83–87. Maassen normally refers to Verona LIX (57) as the *veroneser Fragment*; see Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 761–63, and above, n. 59.

194 Two important exceptions are worth noting: First, the collection of Verona LIX (57) lacks the canons of Constantinople (381), but this could be due to the breaking of the manuscript in the middle of the canons of Laodicea, after which the canons of Constantinople normally occur in the Corpus. And second, the collection of Verona LIX (57) does not enumerate its canons at all. It thereby avoids the confusing enumeration in the ancient *Isidoriana*, according to which the canons of Nicaea are numbered from *i* to *xx*, the following canons of Serdica from *i* to *xl*, and the canons of Ancyra onward from *xxi* to *clx*.

a shared rubric that identifies them all as Nicene.¹⁹⁵ Another notable departure of the vulgate recension of Verona LIX (57) from the ancient *Isidoriana* is its transmitted Nicene Creed, which includes the rare endnote we have encountered before in the Antiochenes' *Confessio* of *Coll. Sich.* 5. In Verona LIX (57), following the continuous series of Nicene and Serdican canons, the manuscript presents the Nicene Creed with its rare endnote, followed by a list of participants in the Council of Nicaea. This particular order of presentation—canons, credal statement, list of participants—seems to be one of the few common features in the surviving Latin witnesses of the creed's rare endnote.¹⁹⁶ This observation corresponds to Eduard Schwartz's reconstruction of the original Greek Antiochene Corpus, which, after each block of canons from a particular council, normally included a credal statement and the council's list of participants.¹⁹⁷ The survival of these additions in the Nicene section of the canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) thus highlights an important challenge to the familiar scholarly typologies of canonical collections: in this case, we find a witness of the vulgate *Isidoriana* recension transmitting material older than the ancient *Isidoriana*.

To sum up the key information I reviewed in this section: The canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) transmits one of the oldest preserved Latin translations of an even older Greek canonical collection. The latter is known in scholarship as the Antiochene Corpus. The surviving evidence strongly suggests that Cyril of Alexandria, among others, was involved in dispatching the Antiochene Corpus to North Africa, from where it was subsequently transmitted to Rome. The historical circumstance that led to the corpus's arrival in North Africa and its translation into Latin was a legislative exchange between Carthage and Rome in 419. The canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) reflects the fundamental matter around which that legislative

exchange revolved: the inclusion of the canons of the Council of Serdica (343) together with, and under the same rubric of, the canons of the Council of Nicaea (325). In terms of my argument in favor of tracing the *Sichardiana*'s provenance to Byzantine Africa, the discussion in this section offered us two key pieces of evidence: first, the African connection underlying the history of the canonical collection of Verona LIX (57); and second, the canonical collection's relation to the *Sichardiana*. The relation is demonstrated through the rare endnote of the Nicene Creed, which is transmitted in both the canonical collection and the Antiochenes' *Confessio* (*Coll. Sich.* 5), and through the *Sichardiana*'s transmission of Cyril's letter to the Carthaginian council (*Coll. Sich.* 13), a letter whose history is embedded in the same circumstances that engendered the canonical collection.

The *Sichardiana* and the Canonical Collection of Verona LIX (57)

Before taking the above detour where I reviewed the early history of canonical codification in the Latin West, I suggested that the sixth-century North African editor of the *Sichardiana* could have associated the canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) (henceforth *V*) with the Nicene material that Cyril had sent to Africa in the early fifth century. What we have learned so far from the scholarly debates around early canonical codification makes such an association historically inaccurate: since the Nicene–Serdican connection was a western innovation, its occurrence in *V* proves without a doubt that the canonical collection could not have been the one sent from the Greek East in the early fifth century.¹⁹⁸ But our ability to discern the historical inaccuracy of the above claim does not prove that late antique contemporaries could easily do the same. And rather than expecting from the late antique texts we study—in this case, the *Sichardiana*—the same standards of historical research respected by modern scholars, we should

195 Verona LIX (57), fol. 216r (see above, n. 59). The Serdican canons start in fol. 222r immediately after the twentieth canon of Nicaea.

196 Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen," 14–15, where he suggests that the original function of the note in the original Greek Antiochene Corpus was to introduce the following list of participants. Recall that the note has not survived in Greek in the context of a canonical collection, appearing only in the Antiochenes' *Confessio* and the Cyzicenus's *Ecclesiastical History* (see above, nn. 166–67). See also Turner, *Ecclesiae*, 1.1.2, 110–11.

197 Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen," 3–18.

198 Moreover, the Serdican canons were unheard of in Greek canonical collections before the middle of the sixth century, and were never part of any surviving Greek recensions of the Antiochene Corpus as they were in its translated Latin versions: Wagschal, *Law and Legality*, 39, and H. Ohme, "Sources of the Greek Canon Law to the Quinisext Council (691/2): Councils and Church Fathers," in *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500*, ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (Washington, DC, 2021), 74.

instead be open to the peculiar perspectives and limited conditions that framed their authors' research, methodologies, and scholarly objectives.

The transmission of the vulgate *Isidoriana* in early medieval manuscripts demonstrates that the Roman consolidation of the Nicene and Serdican canons into a continuous series had an impact far and wide as it spread throughout the Latin West.¹⁹⁹ Its effects even reached North Africa, where we find the most direct evidence of questioning the Nicene attribution of the Serdican canons, as we saw in the previous section. In an apparent African section of the *Corpus Canonum Africano-Romanum*, for example, we find hints that suggest an acceptance of the Serdican canons as part of the Nicene tradition.²⁰⁰ Another example comes from the *Breviatio Canonum* by the Carthaginian deacon Fulgentius Ferrandus (d. 546 or 547). In the *Breviatio*'s treatment of the Serdican canons, Ferrandus makes a telling error that demonstrates the continued presence of the Nicene–Serdican connection in sixth-century North Africa: when he catalogs the first canon of the Council of Serdica, he actually refers to the contents of the twentieth (and last) canon of Nicaea.²⁰¹ This mistake reveals that Ferrandus did not properly identify where the Nicene canons end and the first Serdican canon begins, since he probably relied on a canonical collection that treated the Nicene and Serdican canons as a continuous series.

It is therefore clear that *V* is a canonical collection that certainly could have been available in a sixth-century North African archive. And if, when collecting the documents of the *Sichardiana*, its editor turned to an archival folder pertaining to Apiarius's case that included the episode when Cyril of Alexandria had sent the Nicene records to Carthage, *V* certainly could

have represented an old, perhaps the oldest, canonical collection in that folder. It surely was enough for the editor of the *Sichardiana* that the particular version of the Nicene Creed in *V* matched the particular version of the creed in the Antiochenes' *Confessio*. Our editor was thus able to show clearly that the Antiochenes confessed to an ancient version of the creed that corresponds to what he was able to find in the archive.²⁰²

Like the editor of the *Sichardiana*, the compiler of Verona LIX (57), too, treated his source material in accordance with standards of historical research that would fall short of our own. As I have shown in the review of the contents of this late sixth-century manuscript, its compiler was very open to separating and to excising materials that did not fit the clear categories according to which the manuscript was organized. If the source material included texts that did not conform to the manuscript's editorial vision, the compiler of Verona LIX (57) either discarded them (such as the numerous items from the *Sichardiana*) or moved them to the segment of the manuscript deemed appropriate. *V* was one of the victims of this editorial vision: our compiler pushed the canonical collection found in the *Sichardiana* to the next segment of the manuscript covering ecclesiastical norms and regulations. The Christological segment of the manuscript (fols. 82r–129v) was consequently cleared from the rather long canonical detour of *V*.

When we think through the editorial options underlying the *Sichardiana* and Verona LIX (57), the letter of Cyril to the Carthaginian council of 419 stands out. The letter, as previously discussed, includes no relevant information on the Nestorian Controversy, which it precedes by roughly a decade. Its absence from Verona LIX (57) also makes sense given what we know

199 Ohme, "Sources of the Greek Canon Law," 74. See also Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 52–55.

200 Field, *On the Communion*, 81–82; Turner, *Ecclesiae*, 1.2.3, 540–42.

201 Fulgentius Ferrandus, *Breviatio Canonum* (CPL 1768), in Munier, *Concilia Africae* (n. 121 above), 305. In chapter 214, under the theme concerning not kneeling in services throughout the fifty days before Easter (*ut diebus quinquagesimae genua non flectantur*), the *Breviatio* refers us to *Concilio Sardicensi, tit. I*. See also Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 56, 800, as well as Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l'Église*, 137–38. Cf. the twentieth Nicene canon as it occurs in various early Latin canonical collections: Turner, *Ecclesiae*, 1.1.2, 142, 231, 243, 273.

202 This hypothesis can even be stretched further: perhaps the Nicene Creed with its rare endnote enabled the editor of the *Sichardiana* to connect not only the Antiochenes and Cyril but also both of them to African Christians. From among the Latin witnesses of this endnote we find one transmission from the proceedings of the Carthaginian council of 419 concerning Apiarius's case (Turner, *Ecclesiae*, 1.1.2, 110; and more generally above, n. 176). During the proceedings, the Africans read the Nicene records preserved in their archive, which included the creed with its rare endnote. The version of the Nicene records read at the Carthaginian council is known in scholarship as the *versio Caeciliani*, named after one of the very few western participants in Nicaea, Caecilianus of Carthage (311–345). For further details on the *Caeciliani*, see Schwartz, "Kanonessammlungen," 45–48.

about its compiler's editorial approach of excising items that contributed little to the section of the manuscript in which they were placed. It was probably for similar reasons that Sichard did not include the letter in his *Antidotum*. Its survival in the *Sichardiana* portion of Arsenal 341 is therefore both fortunate and unique: when we look through the Greek and Latin manuscripts that transmit Cyril's letter, the overwhelming consensus is that the letter's transmission is part of the documentation pertaining to the Carthaginian council of 419.²⁰³ The letter's occurrence in Arsenal 341, in the midst of Christological texts relevant to the debates surrounding Ephesus, is therefore unique and highly unusual.

Schwartz, as noted before, dismissed Cyril's letter and saw its occurrence in Arsenal 341 as an insertion that has nothing with the sequence of documents surrounding it in the manuscript. According to my reconstruction of the *Sichardiana*'s thematic layers, however, the letter perfectly fits the collection: it corresponds to the Nicene theme of the *Sichardiana*, which highlights the staunch Nicene attitudes of the Antiochenes. The editor of the *Sichardiana* did not merely demonstrate the Nicene support of the Antiochenes but also emphasized a very particular version of the Nicene Creed confessed by Cyril and the Antiochene faction of John of Antioch. The *Sichardiana* makes this connection through the Antiochenes' *Confessio* (*Coll. Sich.* 5) and Cyril's letter to the Carthaginian council (*Coll. Sich.* 13), together with the ancient Nicene records of *V*, the canonical collection of the vulgate *Isidoriana* recension transmitted in Verona LIX (57). The editor of the *Sichardiana* could have easily associated the Nicene

records of *V* with the appended records mentioned in Cyril's letter; but when the *Sichardiana* reached the hands of the compiler of Verona LIX (57), *V* was removed from its original documentary context and placed in a different segment of the manuscript.



My analysis of the *Sichardiana* began with its three sources. Exploring the contents of Verona LIX (57), Arsenal 341, and Sichard's *Antidotum*, I tried to contextualize the fragmentary nature of the *Sichardiana*'s survival. Either because of their own fragmented survival or because of the editorial decisions that shaped them, the *Sichardiana*'s three sources tended not to transmit and to preserve their own source materials in their integrity. This was especially the case with the oldest witness of the collection, Verona LIX (57). In delving deeper into the contents of *Sichardiana*, I returned to various documents in Verona LIX (57) that seem to complement the *Sichardiana* but, because of the editorial decisions that shaped the manuscript, were separated to different locations in the manuscript: the Chalcedonian acts and the vulgate *Isidoriana* canonical collection were moved to the segment dedicated to ecclesiastical norms and regulations, and it is a distinct possibility that some florilegia were separated from their original *Sichardiana* context and concentrated in their own dedicated part of the manuscript.²⁰⁴ Even though the late sixth-century Verona LIX (57) transmits only four of the collection's documents, the thematic embeddedness of the *Sichardiana* in this late antique witness suggests the sixth century as the terminus ante quem of

203 All the Latin manuscripts edited in Munier come from canonical collections that include the acts of the Carthaginian council of 419. See the critical apparatus in his *Concilia Africae*, 162, xviii, for further bibliography on the relevant recensions, as well as Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen*, 358. We find a similar transmission context in the Greek tradition of the letter: in Joannou's *Discipline générale antique* (n. 121 above), it appears as part of the records of the Carthaginian council of 419, which were translated from Latin into Greek. Together with other acts of African councils, they were all incorporated into Greek canonical collections from the late sixth century, on which see Ohme, "Sources of the Greek Canon Law," 75, and Wagschal, *Law and Legality*, 39–40. It therefore seems that the Greek tradition of Cyril's letter preserves not its original Greek but rather its retranslation from Latin: the letter most likely had been originally composed in Greek, later translated into Latin for the records of the Carthaginian council of 419, and then translated back into Greek together with the Carthaginian materials among which we find the letter in the Greek canonical tradition.

204 As the Christological controversies of late antiquity show, the patristic florilegium was a common literary tool used by the debaters when arguing their cases: Gray, "The Select Fathers" (n. 151 above), 21–36. The inclusion of florilegia among the original *Sichardiana* documents should therefore not surprise us. The florilegia with the strongest dyophysite leaning in Verona LIX (57) are those from Leo's Tome (see above, nn. 56, 64) and from the concluding address of the Council of Chalcedon to Emperor Marcian (see above, n. 56). The textual history of the latter is particularly revealing: There is evidence to suggest that the florilegium was not part of the original Greek publication of the council's acts and was added only later in the 450s following its contentious reception. The notable dyophysite, pro-Antiochene slant of the florilegium, as well as the choice of some particular citations, has led scholars to suggest that none other than Theodoret of Cyrillus was behind its assembly (Price and Gaddis, *Council of Chalcedon* [n. 15 above], 3:104–7).

the collection's assembly, and invalidates the possibility that the collection originated in a later medieval or early modern context.

In continuing to explore the contents of the *Sichardiana*, I highlighted further evidence to strengthen the collection's late antique provenance. Throughout the documents of the *Sichardiana*, the dispute underlying the Three Chapters Controversy played out via a tripartite factionalism: the Antiochene faction, with which the Three Chapters were affiliated; Cyril of Alexandria's faction, which led the anti-Nestorian efforts in Ephesus throughout the summer of 431; and finally Nestorius's faction. Referring to both the Antiochenes and Cyril in the collection's rubrics with similar honorifics such as *beatus* and *sanctus* (*Coll. Sich.* 4, 11, 12, 15), the editor of the *Sichardiana* leveled the playing field and framed the underlying dispute as a dialogue between equally orthodox theologians. Documents that demonstrate how much the Christological visions of both the Antiochenes and Cyril complemented each other (*Coll. Sich.* 7–12, 15, 18) further diminished the historical significance of the dispute between the two factions and clarified that the core dispute was not even between them. It was fueled purely by Nestorius's teachings. Although scholars of the Nestorian Controversy have appreciated this seemingly obvious fact for centuries, we also know that the controversy was greatly exacerbated by the Antiochenes' conciliar actions against Cyril and members of his faction in Ephesus, as well as by the Antiochenes' attacks against and refutations of Cyril's *Twelve Chapters*. The Antiochene contributions to the dispute are either ignored or brushed aside in the *Sichardiana*. Instead, the collection's focus on Nestorius is foregrounded in the three opening documents (*Coll. Sich.* 1–3) and in the continuous clarifications of Cyril on the matter (*Coll. Sich.* 1, 4, 10, 15). On the Antiochene side, however, the lack of anti-Nestorian sentiments in the surviving evidence led the collection's editor to take a different editorial approach: to choose documents with Antiochene texts and citations that completely ignore Nestorius or his teaching (esp. *Coll. Sich.* 5–6, 14). It is only in the conclusion of the last document of the collection (*Coll. Sich.* 18, dated to 448!) that we find the sole example of an Antiochene condemnation of Nestorius and his teachings. According to the tripartite factionalism of the dispute as it is constructed in the *Sichardiana*, the Antiochenes were a distinct faction from Nestorius's, did not share

his teaching, and actually had more in common with Cyril than with Nestorius, whom they continuously ignored and never defended in their official letters, Christological treatises, and synodal documents. The dispute's tripartite factionalism correlates to prevailing apologetic arguments against the condemnation of the Three Chapters during the middle of the sixth century. I therefore argue that the collection was assembled for similar apologetic purposes in the same period.

The next stage of my analysis attempted to narrow down the *Sichardiana*'s geographical origin. Alongside implicit or explicit references to Byzantine Africa in two documents (*Coll. Sich.* 12 and 13), the emphasis in the *Sichardiana* on the Nicene adherence of the Antiochenes offered us an important clue: not only do we know of significant resistance to the condemnation of the Three Chapters in mid-sixth-century North Africa, but we also have evidence that some North Africans highlighted exactly the Antiochenes' adherence to the Council of Nicaea in their attempt to argue against the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Such an argument corresponds well with the not-too-distant memories of the anti-Nicene persecutions that the African church had suffered under the Vandals. And Justinian I's request that African clerics condemn the Three Chapters, who, as the Africans quickly learned, had been staunch Nicenes, did not sit well with some of them who had personally experienced the Vandal persecutions.

This likely was not enough, however, for the editor of the *Sichardiana* to show that the Antiochenes had been staunch Nicenes. There is evidence to suggest that our editor attempted to demonstrate that the Antiochenes and Cyril had confessed to the very same and rarely attested version of the Nicene Creed, which Cyril might have also sent to Carthage in the early fifth century along with other Nicene records (*Coll. Sich.* 13). The survival of the rare version of the Nicene Creed in the Antiochenes' *Confessio* (*Coll. Sich.* 5) and in the vulgate *Isidoriana* canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) does not seem like a coincidence. Especially in light of what we know of the editorial liberties taken by the manuscript's compiler, it is a distinct possibility that the *Sichardiana* documents and the canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) were part of the same source. Adding weight to this suggestion is the peculiar historical background of the canonical collection of Verona LIX (57) and its North African connection.

In order to strengthen even further my argument for the North African provenance of the *Sichardiana*, I would have to deal with a lingering problem that this paper has so far avoided: the possibility that the *Sichardiana* was actually envisioned and assembled in Europe, specifically in Verona or its north Italian surroundings. After all, the earliest evidence we have of the *Sichardiana* survives in a late sixth-century manuscript from Verona. Dealing with this problem satisfactorily would exceed the scope of this paper, especially since its solution, I believe, rests on exploring a significantly broader research problem that was highlighted throughout the twentieth century but has yet to receive the appropriate scholarly attention: despite the survival of very few manuscripts from late antique North Africa,²⁰⁵ we find a notable concentration of North African materials—especially letters, treatises, and canonical collections—in a group of early medieval manuscripts that are housed in the Biblioteca Capitolare of Verona,²⁰⁶ or in manuscripts whose provenance traces

back to Verona.²⁰⁷ It has even been suggested that the half-uncial script in which some of these manuscripts were written, including Verona LIX (57), is of North African origin.²⁰⁸ What is particularly striking about the Verona manuscripts of African background is that, like Verona LIX (57), they frequently transmit various texts whose contents relate to the wider Mediterranean world of late antique Christianity. As we have seen in Verona LIX (57) and the *Collectio Sichardiana*, further evidence of this elaborate North African scholarly tradition is dispersed in other European manuscripts. The reconstruction of this opaque scholarly tradition would better contextualize the African background of the *Sichardiana* and thereby undercut the possibility that its origin was European. Moreover, a better understanding of the North African scholarly tradition would demonstrate its hitherto unappreciated participation in and contribution to intellectual trends that crossed the Mediterranean world of late antiquity and beyond.

Department of History
129 Dickinson Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544
omrim@princeton.edu

205 *CLA* 12: viii–ix, and further relevant references in Field, *On the Communion*, 85, n. 115.

206 Verona I (1), *CLA* 4: no. 476; Verona XXII (20), *CLA* 4: no. 490; Verona LIII (51), *CLA* 4: no. 506; and Verona LX (58), *CLA* 4: no. 510. See also T. Licht, *Halbunziale: Schriftkultur im Zeitalter der ersten lateinischen Minuskel (III.–IX. Jahrhundert)* (Stuttgart, 2018), 209–17. It would also be worth exploring the Ephesian and Chalcedonian conciliar materials transmitted in two slightly older manuscripts (ninth or tenth century), Verona LVII (55) and Verona LVIII (56); for further details on these two, see Spagnolo, *Manoscritti* (n. 33 above), 107–10.

207 Vat. Lat. 1322, *CLA* 1: no. 8, and Paris BnF lat. 12214, *CLA* 5: no. 635.

208 Field, *On the Communion*, 95–97.

✂ I WOULD LIKE TO OFFER MY THANKS TO Walter Beers, Avshalom Laniado, Helmut Reimitz, and Jack Tannous for their input throughout the course of researching and writing this paper. I am also

thankful for the invaluable feedback from the anonymous reviewers arranged by *DOP*. None of the above should be implicated in this paper's deficiencies and weaknesses.

Appendix I: The *Sichardiana* Documents in the *ACO*

An almost complete version of the *Sichardiana* is printed in *ACO* 1.5.2, 247–318. Several documents, however, are presented there with only their incipit, explicit, or rubric. In such cases, I will refer to the page(s) in *ACO* 1.5.2 where the incipit, explicit, or rubric is found, followed by the edition (*ACO* or otherwise) where the full text can be found. Documents' titles normally follow the entries in the *CPG*.

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 1 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Third Letter to Nestorius</i> (<i>CPG</i> 5317), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 247 (incipit and explicit only). See <i>ACO</i> 1.5.1, 236:1–244:15. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 2 | Pseudo-Nestorius, <i>Twelve Counter-Chapters against Cyril</i> (<i>CPG</i> 5761), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 247:8–249:7. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 3 | Pseudo-Nestorius, <i>Exposition of Faith</i> (<i>CPG</i> 8721), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 249 (incipit only). See <i>ACO</i> 2.3.1, 213:5–215:21. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 4 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Contra Theodoretum</i> (<i>CPG</i> 5222), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 249:12–287:17, with interpolation from Cyril's <i>Apologia XII capitulorum contra Orientales</i> (<i>CPG</i> 5221) and <i>Explanatio XII capitulorum</i> (<i>CPG</i> 5223). |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 5 | John of Antioch et al., <i>The Synod of Orientals' Exposition of Faith</i> (<i>CPG</i> 6353), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 287:18–288:29. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 6 | Anonymous, <i>Refutation of Cyril of Alexandria's Twelve Chapters</i> (<i>CPG</i> 6360), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 288:30–294:42. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 7 | Dionysius Exiguus, <i>Letter to John and Leontius</i> (<i>CPL</i> 653a), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 294:43–295:27. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 8 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>First Letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea</i> (ep. 45; <i>CPG</i> 5345), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 295:28–299:26. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 9 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Second Letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea</i> (ep. 46; <i>CPG</i> 5346), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 299:27–302:41. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 10 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Letter to Acacius of Melitene</i> (ep. 40; <i>CPG</i> 5340), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 303:1–307:3. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 11 | Paul of Emesa, <i>Second Homily: About the Nativity</i> (<i>CPG</i> 6366), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 307:4–309:34. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 12 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Third Homily: Response to Paul of Emesa</i> (<i>CPG</i> 5247), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 310:1–25. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 13 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Letter to the Carthaginian Council</i> (ep. 85; <i>CPG</i> 5385), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 310 (incipit only). See C. Munier, <i>Concilia Africae, a. 345–a. 525</i> , CCSL 149 (Turnhout, 1974), 162–63. See also P. P. Joannou, ed., <i>Discipline générale antique (IV^e–IX^e s.)</i> , t. 1, vol. 2 (Grottaferrata, 1962), 422–24. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 14 | John of Antioch et al., <i>Letter to Cyril (pro Theodoro)</i> (<i>CPG</i> 6312), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 311:1–314:6. |
| <i>Coll. Sich.</i> 15 | Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Letter to John of Antioch (pro Theodoro)</i> (ep. 91; <i>CPG</i> 5391), <i>ACO</i> 1.5.2, 314:7–315:20. |

- Coll. Sicb.* 16 Dionysius Exiguus, *Letter to Felicianus and Pastor* (CPL 653c), *ACO* 1.5.2, 315 (title only). See *ACO* 4.2, 196:1–197:22.
- Coll. Sicb.* 17 Proclus of Constantinople, *Tome to the Armenians* (CPG 5897), *ACO* 1.5.2, 315 (title only). See *ACO* 4.2, 197:23–205:42.
- Coll. Sicb.* 18 Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Letter to Dioscorus of Alexandria* (ep. 83; CPG 6240), *ACO* 1.5.2, 315:23–318:16.

Appendix II: The Distribution of the *Sichardiana*'s Documents in Its Three Sources

Document	≈ length in pp. ¹	<i>Antidotum</i>	Arsenal 341	Verona LIX (57)
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 1	8 (9%)	148r–150r		
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 2	2 (2%)	150v–151r		
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 3	2 (2%)	151r–152r		
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 4	38 (44%)	152r–167r	85r–110r	12r–72v
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 5	1 (1%)	167v–168r		
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 6	6 (7%)	168r–170v ²		
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 7	1 (1%)	170v–171r	110r–110v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 8	4 (4.5%)	171r–172v	110v–113v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 9	3 (3.5%)	172v–173v	113v–116r	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 10	4 (4.5%)	173v–175r ³	116r–119r ⁴	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 11	2 (2%)		119r–120v	73r–76v
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 12	1 (1%)		120v–121r	76v–77v
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 13	0.5 (0.5%)		121r–121v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 14	3 (3.5%)		121v–123v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 15	1 (1%)		123v–124v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 16	1 (1%)	175v	124v–125v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 17	8 (9%)	176r–181r	125v–131v	
<i>Coll. Sich.</i> 18	3 (3.5%)			77v–81v

1 I determined the approximate length according to the printed edition of the documents as cited in Appendix I.

2 Begins in fol. 168r, line 22, with Cyril's first anathema. The document begins without either a rubric or any break that distinguishes it from the previous document. See above, n. 102, for further details.

3 Begins in fol. 173v, line 48, with the words *Christum denique vocitatum*. The letter is introduced without either a rubric or any break that distinguishes it from the previous document. The merging of *Coll. Sich.* 9 and 10 into a single document occurs also in Arsenal 341 (see the next note). A brief discussion is offered in *ACO* 1.5.2, 303.

4 Begins in fol. 116r, line 23 (first column), with the words *Xp̄m denique vocitatū*. See the previous note.